OCT 14 1959

Presented to
United
Theological Seminary
Library
Dayton, Ohio

by

Harold D. Halderman

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/expositor0009unse

THE EXPOSITOR

VOLUME IX

List of Contributors to Volume IX.

Rev. Professor W. Emery Barnes, D.D.

Rev. T. Barns, M.A.

Rev. Professor W. H. Bennett, D.D., D.Lit.

Very Rev. Professor J. H. Bernard, D.D.

Rev. Arthur Carr, M.A.

Dom Chapman, O.S.B.

Rev. Professor T. K. Cheyne, D.D.

Rev. Professor Samuel Ives Curtiss.

Rev. Professor W. L. Davidson, LL.D.

Rev. Professor James Denney, D.D.

Rev. Professor S. R. Driver, D.D.

Rev. Professor G. G. Findlay, D.D.

Rev. M. Kaufmann, M.A.

E. E. Kellett, M.A.

Rev. J. B. Mayor, M.A., D.Lit.

Rev. George Milligan, M.A., D.D.

Rev. Professor J. H. Moulton, M.A., D.Lit.

Rev. Professor A. S. Peake, M.A.

Professor W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L., LL.D.

Professor Alex. Souter, M.A.

Rev. Canon Todd, M.A., B.Sc.

Rev. T. A. Weir, M.R.A.S.

Rev. Newport J. D. White, M.A.

THE

EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

SIXTH SERIES

Volume IX

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
E965
47.911

London:
HODDER AND STOUGHTON,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MCMIV.

Butler & Tanner,
The Selwood Printing Works,
Frome, and London.

AN APPEAL FOR A HIGHER EXEGESIS.[1]

"Open Thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy law."—*Ps.* cxix. 18.

Not many years ago an Oxford teacher "to memory dear" expressed the hope that the age of Biblical criticism was nearly past. He must have meant that the literary or philological study of the Bible had almost done its work, and that another guide was needed to lead disciples from the outer court of the temple into the Holy of holies. Need I justify myself as to some extent at least a critic for using such a phrase? *That* were to admit that there was some truth in the current prejudice that keen criticism and a firm hold on the unseen realities cannot be united in the same persons. But do our popular writers really imagine that critics are Nihilists, and seek to "burn up all the houses (meeting-places) of God in the land?" Do not we Biblical critics know as well as any simple-minded Christian that a most holy place exists, and that a certain tone of mind and quality of experience are required in those who would enter it? Need I protest that our critical freedom is not the freedom of scepticism, but of a purified faith—of a faith which, being spiritual and experimental, can afford to be patient while the security of its outworks is being tested? I count it a happy thing that protestations are needless to-day in an Oxford which is not divided into two camps, and in which differences of opinion do not issue in calumnious

[1] Preached as a University sermon in St. Mary's Church, Oxford, October 25, 1903, but with the hope of reaching a wider audience.

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
OCT 14 1959

misrepresentations. Faith, as the Oxford of to-day knows full well, is the jewel of the soul alike to the critic and to the simple-minded Christian, and so, too, it was to the eminent teacher of whom I have spoken. Nor need any Biblical critic quarrel with this unflattering Mentor for the trenchant words which I have quoted. He surely meant that literary and textual criticism ought by this time to have led to something better than an exegesis which appeals predominantly to philological specialists. He longed for a turn in the road, but he knew that a more satisfying exegesis could not possibly arise till the old Christian principle of a revelation of divine wisdom, not limited to a single race, had been more fully accepted by modern theology.

The application of this principle may be still very imperfect, and yet it may be right for some of us to take a first step forward, and begin to deal, less with the grammar and the lexicon, and more with the religious ideas and beliefs of the books interpreted. The main results of a sound philological criticism must indeed be recorded in our Prolegomena, but not at such length as to divert attention from our highest and grandest object. Our ambition as interpreters is nothing less than to get to the heart of the Old Testament, and to trace the converging lines of a real and not merely theoretical development of ideas and beliefs, on the basis of a critical study of the several strata of the old Jewish writings in their historical connexion. And in order to get this connexion we must take some trouble about the ideas and beliefs of the neighbours of the Jews, historically regarded. We must not think it unseemly to compare any possibly related facts of the Babylonio-Assyrian, the Arabian, the Egyptian, or the Iranian religions, and to utilize the varied illustrative material provided by the comparative psychology of peoples and by anthropology. And as a condition of complete success we must approach the study of religious phenomena,

not in the detached spirit of an anatomist, or of a visitor from another planet, but with the sympathy born of the consciousness that modern religion is largely of primitive origin, and with the humility expressed in the prayer, "Open Thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy law."

And now, just because we desire, in the spirit of this prayer, to strengthen in ourselves and others a truly spiritual faith, and with a view to this, to get to the heart of the older Bible, it is our duty to listen to voices which call us back for a time to preliminary tasks as yet imperfectly accomplished. By all means let us, each and all, make what contributions we can to the higher exegesis, but let no one think it superfluous to scrutinize somewhat closely the text on which we still for the most part base our critical work. To the comparative soundness of parts—it is hardly safe to speak more definitely—of the received text, I bear my testimony; no one who has passed through the school of the great period now closed can do otherwise. And yet it is only too possible that some, or even many, parts may have been only half understood owing to a superficiality and a narrowness in our use of critical method. The mere suspicion of this ought to make us nobly discontented, and if it can be proved that there is more than a mere suspicion of it, we ought not to rest till we have begun the hard work of a re-examination of the texts. In the bracing air of a new century we ought not to feel any task beyond our powers, knowing that God, who allots to each century its task, can so intensify our will that we shall be able to do better than what has hitherto been deemed our best.

The subject is one which may fitly be referred to in this pulpit, because, though the evidences of true religion are in the last resort phenomena of experience, yet the material forms which the utterances of faith assume are supplied

partly by historical circumstances, partly by beliefs not strictly speaking religious, and these can only be ascertained by the careful study of ancient texts. Hence a theology which began by being dogmatic has to become in one of its chief aspects historical, and with this in view must be largely concerned with exegesis. But a really sound exegesis must be critical, and this involves a searching and methodical examination of the textual tradition. Let no one therefore despise textual criticism, or discourage attempts to raise that study, and first of all the Old Testament part of it, to a higher level. Provided that textual critics remember that criticism is not an end in itself, but has the privilege of contributing to something far higher and nobler, their work is as truly church-work as that of the historical theologian; indeed, I presume it to be quite possible that a textual critic may be also a historical theologian. Nor need those who aim at a higher ideal regret having to retrace their steps, and resume tasks supposed to have been in all essentials accomplished, for it is the condition of historical progress that the results of one age should be perfected in another, and if those who can would only take up the work of training themselves and others in the use of more varied methods, the revision of the text of the Old Testament would perhaps quickly pass into a more fully satisfactory stage.

And even though, in spite of the deadlock at which it may be feared that we are arriving, it may be too much to hope that this will be soon adequately done, those who think with me need not be downcast. It may even be well that there should for a time be those who prefer to keep their minds in suspense. Those who hope and believe that the deepest desire of all the best scholars is for progress—progress at whatever cost to cherished personal opinions—can afford to extend a welcome to much critical work which is not altogether to their mind. Their practical policy may be ex-

pressed thus. Let there still be workers who as a rule assume the results of that nineteenth century scholarship to which we all owe so much—workers whose learning and capacity are deserving of all respect. Such scholars may, in matters of textual criticism and philology, be slow to move, but so far as relates to the study of religious ideas and their historical embodiments, there is good reason to believe that they are heartily in favour of it. But, in order to escape from that deadlock of which I spoke with apprehension, and to correct one-sidedness, let there also be scholars of a somewhat different type—scholars who, though ardent lovers of exegesis, yet feel bound to devote some of their best energies first to textual researches, and next to showing from time to time how, in their experience, the Old Testament study in all its departments is deriving benefit from these inquiries.

It is one of the most important departments of Old Testament study to which I would now draw your attention. To the priceless literary monuments of prophecy all the partners in our new venture will certainly in the near future return with fresh interest. In those records some of the highest and most distinctive phenomena of Israelitish religion are presented to us in a historical setting. It is this setting which gives so much reality to the religious phenomena, and to have made it even to a small extent comprehensible is the undeniable merit of nineteenth century criticism.

It is encouraging to notice that the leaders of the Christian community are awakening to the consciousness of their debt. "We are beginning," says one of them, "to feel the warmth and light and reality coming back to the pale and shadowy figures of the Old Testament. Isaiah and Hosea and Jeremiah no longer walk in a *limbus patrum*, but we see them as they were among the forces by which they were actually surrounded. We see what they were as

men; we see what they were as exponents of a message from God; we see the grand and glorious ideas which stirred within them in all their richness and fulness, conditioned, yet not wholly so, by the world of thought and action in which they moved." The judgement is in the main correct, nor could any acknowledgment on the part of the Church be too great for such a service. The result has been chiefly won by the use of the highly polished instruments of literary criticism, which, even in the pre-Assyriological stage, elicited much wonderful truth concerning the prophets, and in the light of the earlier Assyrian discoveries seemed able to assign to most of the prophecies, with varying degrees of probability, the right historical position. It then became possible for educated Christians to attach a permanent importance to prophecy, because revelation no longer meant the mechanical communication to the prophets of a message from without, but the opening of the inner nature of specially prepared men to receive indications of the will of God in their own moral nature and in the world around them. It was an entirely new view of revelation, and though it was in harmony with the progressive religious thought of the time, it could not have been established without a keen literary criticism of the prophetic writings.

It may not be superfluous to add that the critics of whom I speak were well aware of their limitations. How the prophetic conception of God arose, they did not undertake to say; the evidence was too imperfect. But one thing they could affirm—that the conception had inherent vitality, and that when once it had arisen, development continually went on, so that new phases of belief could, for historical purposes, be sufficiently accounted for from previously existing phenomena. It was also considered that the functions of a prophet were complex, and had a social and political as well as a religious aspect, nor did it in those

days appear inconsistent with the character of a theologian to recognize the political, or with that of a historian to recognize and to interpret the religious element in the higher prophecy.

It is, however, one of the new questions now before us whether the more recent Assyriological investigations require us as historical students of the Old Testament (1) to give vastly greater prominence to the political character of the prophets, and (2) to abandon the attempt to trace a purely internal development of prophetic religion. One or two other important points may also presently be alluded to. I ask your patience. It is indeed in your own interest. These difficulties have to be wrestled with, in order that the Church may be able to possess her soul in peace.

With regard to the first point it is a leader among the younger Assyriologists who declares the significance of the Hebrew prophets to be, from the historical point of view, primarily political. In the days when the history of Israel was entirely in the hands of historical theologians, Amos and Isaiah were regarded as, in a sense which no fair critic will understand, religious geniuses, and received a special place in the history of Israel on this ground. To-day, however, it is seriously maintained that in a thoroughly critical history of Israel the significance even of an Isaiah must be distinctively political, and that Amos went about preaching the re-union of North and South Israel—or, as we might say, took up the pan-Israelitish idea—as the mouthpiece of the policy of King Ahaz. Now, is there any adequate justification for this view?

So much, I think, must certainly be granted that to the unreceptive multitude, whether nobles or plebeians, Isaiah and Amos must have appeared to be mere ordinary dervishes, mediocre and injudicious politicians. It must also be admitted that even admirers of Isaiah—the hagiologists who speak to us in Isaiah xxxvi.–xxxix.—rest his claims to

recognition, not on the depths of his religious thought, but on his power of foreseeing and foretelling the fortunes of the state. The multitude, however, cannot lay down the law to history, nor can we hold that the small number of those who appreciated Isaiah justifies a historian in disregarding the religious significance of that leading prophet. Surely the development of religion is a very important section of Israelitish history. Surely, too, this Assyriologist, if he had had a wider vision, would have perceived that, to quote from a Jewish fellow-student of prophecy belonging to this university, "though the genius of the prophets enabled them to cast a piercing glance into political affairs. . . . the political advice which they gave was suggested and controlled by their religious convictions," and that "we must regard the prophets as they regarded themselves—as religious teachers, as messengers of Yahwè, commissioned to explain to their people the immediate purposes and mandates of their God.[1]

The Assyriologist of whom I have spoken is one who cannot justly be neglected, nor can it be denied that he has thrown a bright if not always a true light on many important points connected with the history of the Israelites. And even if in the present case he has revived a theory which had appeared to us to be obsolete, he helps us individually by putting it upon new grounds derived from a profound study of the fundamental ideas of Babylonian culture. A political agitator in the countries of Nearer Asia was not such a man as we might designate by that name. He had a calling which might fairly be described as religious as well as political, because it was based upon the belief that it was the gods who, in the most realistic sense, directed human affairs, and that the fortunes of men were written upon the starry heavens. And if he was a politician, it was in no narrow sense. To whichever

[1] Montefiore, *Hibbert Lectures* (1892), pp. 150, 153.

party he belonged, it was one that existed in all the countries under Assyrian influence. He was either an imperialist or an anti-imperialist, and was enabled to keep himself in touch with the members of his party everywhere by the identity of culture and consequent facility of intercourse throughout the Nearer East. In fact, the state of the political atmosphere in the other regions of the Nearer East, as well as in Assyria itself, must have been almost as well known in the leading circles of Jerusalem as it was in Nineveh, so that Isaiah, a highly cultivated man, who mixed with all classes, and talked with travellers and ambassadors, had the best material, both Jewish and foreign, upon which to base thoroughly statesmanlike conclusions.

In these sentences I have but interpreted Winckler, and if, even when thus plausibly presented, the theory that the prophets were political agitators is unsatisfactory, we may reasonably hold that the higher view of prophecy, for which the last century critics have done so much, gains additional security.

With regard to the second point, I must once more express the conviction that one of the subjects in which the earlier exegesis was, inevitably, most deficient is that of the relation of the higher religion of the Israelites to the religions of the peoples around them. The two peoples which appear likely to have had most religious influence on the Israelites are the Babylonians and the Persians. The evidence abundantly warrants the assertion that in the later period Babylonian and Persian influence on Jewish religion was very strong. One unites these two names "Babylonian" and "Persian," not merely because first Babylon and then Persia has a claim to be called Israel's teacher, but because it is impossible to draw a hard and fast line between Babylonian and Persian influence, since Babylon began to influence

Persia much earlier than used to be supposed. The truth is that the religious or "cultural" atmosphere in which the Jews lived was charged with elements of immediately diverse though often ultimately kindred origin, so that often one is safer in speaking of Oriental influence than of Babylonian or Persian. To understand even the Psalter without bearing these things in mind is impossible. That the Psalms in their present form present some traces both of Babylonian and of Persian influence can hardly be denied. Carefully as the foreign elements have been adapted to Jewish religion, it is hardly possible for a critic to fail to observé them.

It is, however, the development of prophetic religion of which I now speak. It is true that for the later age we cannot separate this from the development of the religion of the Psalter, which is a record of the religion of the later Jewish community, because prophetic literature of this period was the work of men who, though conventionally called prophets, had no very distinctive gifts or unusual degree of insight. But for the earlier and greater age we are of course limited to the writings of these distinctively gifted men, Amos, Isaiah, and their successors. Between the two periods, according to the ordinary view, comes not only the exilic work of the prophet Ezekiel, but that great work now commonly called the "Prophecy of Restoration." Here it is impossible not to recognize the direct or perhaps rather indirect influence of Babylonian religion on the receptive minds of a disinherited people. But how is it with regard to the greater pre-exilic prophets? Take the case of Isaiah. To what extent may we presume the existence of Babylonian elements in the mental furniture of this prophet?

The time has come when the question can be treated to some extent on the basis of facts. We cannot, it is true, admit that a prophet of Isaiah's high tone lay helpless

before the invasion of Babylonian ideas. Heathenism in all its forms was repugnant to him, and we have no proof that the purified esoteric Babylonian religion in which some of the modern experts believe, was known to this prophet. Indeed, so far as the literary evidence goes, Isaiah seems, on the whole, to have avoided even those Hebraized reflections of Babylonian myths which were most probably current.

But one admission at least must ungrudgingly be made. There was a Babylonian influence which Isaiah could not have escaped; indeed, no member of any of the peoples of Nearer Asia could have escaped it. The discovery of the Tel-el-Amarna cuneiform tablets, and of the tablets of the Tel which has so long covered over the remains of the ancient Taanach in Palestine, prove beyond dispute that Babylonian culture had rooted itself in Palestine many centuries before the time of Isaiah. It is already more than probable that in what we call secular life the Israelites had inherited from their predecessors a culture which was to a large extent Babylonian, and it necessarily follows that their view of superhuman existences must have been considerably affected by the same all-pervading influence.

I do not see how the Church can shut its ears to one extremely probable inference from the facts before us. A comparison of the Creation and Deluge stories of the Hebrews and the Babylonians inevitably suggests that creatorship in a large sense was first ascribed to the God of Israel as a consequence of the adaptation of the Babylonian myths to Israelitish use. The doctrine of the Divine creatorship was Babylonian before it was Jewish. It implies, not indeed necessarily a purified esoteric monotheism, but at least a movement of thought in Babylonia towards monotheism. Even when viewed in its popular aspect, the Babylonian religion was not an unlimited polytheism, and the existence of a qualifying

monarchical element could not help producing in cultivated priestly circles a tendency in a monotheistic direction. Some of the experts now assure us that such a tendency existed as early as the third millennium B.C. If this is right, we may suspect that the esoteric movement spread from Babylonia to some of the priesthoods in Syria, Canaan, and Arabia, and—this is the really important novelty—that the progressive element in prophecy represented by Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah, may thus to some extent be explained. For it is hardly conceivable that even these specially gifted men could entirely dissociate themselves from the great centres of culture and religion in their land.

But the bearings of this new and plausible conjecture are not to be limited to Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah. The history of prophecy itself receives from it a fresh and unexpected light. Far be it from me to assert that the light penetrates into all the dim places. Babylonian influences will not explain everything, just as the phenomena adduced from the religions of more distant peoples do not fully explain the other hard problems of prophecy. It seems plain, however, to those who are at all practised in the comparison of ancient beliefs, that the eschatology of the prophets, as well as the much more distinct eschatology of the apocalyptists and of those influenced by them, developed partly at least—such was the will of the all-controlling Divine Spirit—out of Babylonian germs. To those who acquiesce in the older orthodoxy this result may, I fear, be unpalatable. But dogmatic theology will doubtless be able to assimilate the new facts, and the older orthodoxy cannot pretend to monopolize all religion and all devoutness. Surely one may venture to hope that a time is at hand when a sound historical theory of prophecy will be generally admitted to be favourable and not adverse to a true faith.

And here comes in another question to which at the

outset I only alluded. It is this,—what light, if any, is thrown by a keener textual criticism on the relations of Israel and of Israel's religion to North Arabia?

Some one may perhaps ask, Why Arabia? Surprise, however, is altogether unjustified. Not only were the Israelites, being of a purer Semitic race, more nearly akin to the Arabians than to the Babylonians, but we find them, early in the formative period of their history, sojourning in Arabia, and—if I may make a great statement in few words—it appears most probable that while the Israelites were living with a North Arabian tribe called the Kenites, they learned to worship the supreme deity of the Semitic peoples under a new name—Yahu or Yahwè.

It was not that the Israelites had no supreme God to worship before they became guests of the Kenites. The name under which they had formerly worshipped the supreme God was, according to tradition, El-shaddai. What happened to the Israelites when guests of the Kenites was apparently this, that they rose to a higher conception of the supreme God. This great event is associated with Mount Horeb, where the chief sanctuary of Yahu or Yahwè seems to have been. It is not necessary to suppose that Mount Horeb was in the territory of the Kenites. The worship of the supreme God under the name referred to doubtless extended over a much larger area, within which, however, we are certainly not to place the land of Misrīm (or Misrām).

The land of Misrīm (or Misrām) was, according to tradition, a still earlier abode of the Israelites, who at first received from the inhabitants much kindness and afterwards as much unkindness. It is commonly identified with Egypt, and the identification is an ancient one. But it is doubtful whether this was the earliest view. Strong evidence can be adduced for the theory that it was originally placed to the south of the Negeb, or southern border-land,

and it is probable that the king of Misrīm (or Misrām) was, in the time of David and Solomon, a vassal of the great Minæan kingdom in South Arabia. According to the present results of a keener textual criticism, the Israelites always retained the strongest interest both in the land of Misrīm and in the adjoining South Palestinian or North Arabian border-land, in which the sacred mountain of Horeb lay. When David, who himself started from the south, had taken a firm hold of Palestine, we find his ambitious son Absalom seeking a refuge in his mother's country in the Geshur or Ashhur of North Arabia. Solomon's two great adversaries also came from that region, and it is most probable that Shishak, who made a raid into the land of Judah, was not king of Egypt, but of Misrīm in North Arabia.

If any one objects that all this is a matter of mere antiquarian curiosity, I beg leave to hold a different opinion. As Robertson Smith remarked, in connexion with his own Arabian researches, the matter "has a direct and important bearing on the great problem of the origins of spiritual religion."[1] It can be shown that both in earlier and in later times Arabia exercised a profound religious as well as political influence on Israel. In speaking of Arabian religion, I mean primarily the religion of the North Arabian border-land including the land of Misrīm, but also in the second place that of South Arabia, which, owing to its advanced culture, naturally led the way in matters of religion. What North Arabian religion was, or rather how it impressed the best religious writers of the Israelites, can be discovered to some extent from the Hebrew texts in the light of criticism; what the religion of the dominant South Arabian power was, will only be adequately known when the as yet unpublished inscriptions have been fully studied. But here, as in Palestine, the historical student is prepared to find deep traces of Babylonian influence, and any religious

[1] *Religion of the Semites*, second edition, p. 2.

influence which North or South Arabia may have exercised on Israel was to a large extent a reflexion of the wider influence of Babylonia. The investigation has begun, and, for the sake of far more precious interests, who can wish to check or suppress it?

Meantime the results of a keener textual criticism as regards the connexion of Hebrew prophecy with Arabia are gaining in distinctness. We know already from a tradition which we cannot safely disregard that the stimulus to the higher prophecy was both received and renewed, not in Babylonia, but at Mount Horeb. It has now become not improbable that a large number of the Hebrew prophets were directly or indirectly connected with the North Arabian border-land, and this result throws an unexpected light on dark places in the history of prophecy. But here I must pause. The road which opens before us is, on a first view, not so smooth and easy as that which use and wont have rendered familiar. Nor will I deny that the question of questions before historical theology is not the relation of Arabia, but that of Babylonia, as representing a system of thought and belief, to the people of Israel, and so to Christianity.

Christianity! It were gross timidity to utter this noble word for a still nobler thing only at the close of a sentence. Let me at least offer an answer to my last question, namely, How was it that, while the higher religion of Israel issued in Christianity, that of Babylonia ended in Chaldean superstition? 1. Israel's development was the surer because it was begun later. God's younger son, Israel, profited by the mistakes of his brethren, and the Israel within Israel ripened for the gospel just at the fortunate time. 2. Israel had its prophets, and a parallel to the prophets of Israel—especially the higher prophets—cannot be found in Babylonia. It was perhaps "only the want of the higher spiritual prophecy as a teaching and

purifying agent, and of a longer course of development, which prevented the sacred poetry of Babylonia and Assyria from rivalling that of" the Israelites.[1] Granted that the immediate effect of the preaching of the prophets was but small, the few who listened to it kept up the tradition, and out of these came fresh prophets. Afterwards the effect of prophecy was ensured by the ancient editors, faithful representatives and ministers of the church-nation. 3. Israel was in a certain sense eclectic. Teachers without as well as within Israel contributed to its catholic development. One of these was Babylon, but Persia and Hellas must not be forgotten. 4. Israel had a sacred book, which grew larger as time went on, but never became so large as to lose its popularity. Its composite origin ensured a varied and therefore a healthy development of religious thought. Babylon's religion had no such book to offer; decay and decline were inevitable.

But is it true that Babylon the great has fallen, not to rise again? or that her historical course has issued in the marshy waters of superstition? From one point of view this is the case, but from another and a higher one it is not so. Babylon has indeed fallen, but only as Hellas has fallen, to pass into a higher life. The ineffaceable stamp of Babylon is upon most parts of our modern culture, and it would be strange if there were no traces of her influence on Christian modes of religious representation. I know that the utmost care is needed lest this view should be carried too far. But there is all the difference in the world between affirming on the ground of careful historical research that Christianity, as a historical religion, was likely to admit, and very possibly did admit, into the accounts of its foundation some narratives, the germs of which pre-existed; that it was likely to adopt, and very

[1] *Book of Psalms*, Parchment Library (1884), p. viii. The closing words there are: "of the successors of David."

possibly did adopt, some forms of belief which were equally pre-existent—all this under the moulding operation of a distinctively Christian spirit, and asserting that practically the whole of the gospel narratives are baseless, and that the ideas of the New Testament are mere developments of Babylonian and Persian germs. It is a hard subject to deal with, but a truly absorbing one. And the more we recognize the syncretism of early Christianity, the more, if we have any feeling for religion, shall we be conscious of a distinctively original element which may best be called, in a new sense of the word, holiness, and this consciousness is our safeguard. And if we add to this that essential Christianity, unlike its great rival, Buddhism, has no binding metaphysical system, and can adapt itself to the wants of very various peoples, we are surely entitled to call the gospel the religion of religions—the one pearl of great price.

I turn now to younger students, and ask them to give a full consideration to these things. I have mentioned some of the new problems which come before the student of the Old Testament in the new century. Do you not think them fascinating? Are you not stirred with an anxiety that England, and especially Oxford, should take its full share in their solution? I know that the problems are difficult, but why should young Englishmen draw back from a work because it is hard? I know, too, that a demand will have to be made on your spiritual capacities. The results which already loom before us are such as threaten danger to modes of thought which are often regarded as the only right ones. But if your feet are planted on the impregnable rock of a continually deepening personal experience, and your eyes directed upwards to the source of all light, you will find this new study to have as it were a sacramental virtue. Criticism in the old sense of the word may be dry and tasteless food, and we may permit ourselves

to hope with Jowett that its reign is passing. But criticism in the new sense can fill the mind and enrich the personality, and even its drudgery will be compensated, for it will strengthen our character, and test our devotion to our great object.

I will confess that I myself look forward with hope to the future, not only for the progress of our study, but for the regeneration of the race of students. I know that since I began myself, a number of young men have developed into mature students and teachers. But I do not know that Oxford is doing all that it ought to do. It may be largely the fault of our system; but it may also be in part the fault of the sons of Oxford, both the older and the younger. We do most seriously need a new Oxford movement—a movement among both the teachers and the taught. I am not alone in hoping that such a movement is beginning; but how can one build upon this hope without more evidence that it is not fallacious? It is for you, the younger students of the Bible, to give such evidence. It is for you to become, as Niebuhr, the historian of Rome, once phrased it, wings to your teachers. It is for you, or some of you, to claim your highest privilege, and become fellow-students with your professors, and convert lecture-rooms into workshops, the object of which is to try all methods to push back the bounds of knowledge. For many this doctrine may be too hard. It is doubtless for us and for the directors of this University to make it easier to you. But it is for you to show what is in your mind, the high ideal which animates you. Why should you be outdone by your kinsmen beyond the seas? Courage and hard work are needed on your part. They are needed also on ours.

To the Lord let us commit all our ways. The end and the beginning are from Him; He is the Alpha and the Omega. "He giveth wisdom to the wise, and knowledge to them that know understanding . . . He knoweth what

is in the darkness, and the light dwelleth with Him." But the time which we have upon earth for learning is short. The oldest scholar has to leave behind him half-solved problems. Therefore, "whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might," and since "union is strength," join hands with all those who have kindred ideals, helping them and being helped by them, to whatever school of science, to whatever section of the Christian Church they may belong.

May this appeal to young and old students not be made in vain! May we all unite in simple devotion to our calling, and faithful service to the Church of Christ! And a century hence, may some Oxford scholar, reviewing the academic history, bestow upon us this praise—that in an anxious turning-point of Biblical and religious study, we looked not backward but forward, not inward but upward, out of weakness were made strong, shut the mouths of lions, solved dangerous problems, enlarged the mental horizon, careless of a reputation for consistency, but careful of the smallest grains of God's truth!

T. K. Cheyne.

THE LETTERS TO THE SEVEN CHURCHES OF ASIA.

BEFORE proceeding from the general views on the early Christian correspondence, which were stated in the first chapter of this study,[1] to the remarkable group of letters addressed to the Churches of Asia, I may be permitted to recur to two points.

In the first place, the argument in support of the view that writing on perishable materials was practised from an extremely remote time, though necessarily all remains of such writing have perished long ago, has since been reinforced by the independent and far more weighty opinion which Mr. Arthur J. Evans, fresh from his great excavations in Crete, stated to the British Academy in the end of November. Mr. Evans argues, not from general considerations of probability and analogy, as I did, but by inference from a definite fact: "Ink-written inscriptions on vases also existed, pointing to the former existence of writings on papyrus or other perishable materials."[2] This custom of writing in ink on pottery, especially on broken fragments (called *ostraka*) as being inexpensive, persisted throughout the period of ancient civilization; but the ink, of course, was devised for the purpose of writing on paper and similar materials, and not for use on pottery. The more one thinks over the subject, the more strongly one feels that, as in human nature thought and speech go together in such a way, that word (to use the expression of Plato in the *Theaetetus*) is spoken thought, and thought is unspoken word, so also human beings originally seek by the law of their nature to express their thought in writing as well as in speech; hence

[1] In the EXPOSITOR, Dec. 1903, p. 401 ff.

[2] I quote this from a newspaper report, which is so good, accurate and logical, that it must surely have been revised by the lecturer, and may therefore be regarded as a trustworthy expression of his opinion.

the want of writing argues, at least in some cases, not a primitive, but a degraded and barbarous state.

Secondly, a reference should have been added on p. 419 to a paper by Professor W. Lock, read at the Church Congress, September 29, 1898, in which he rightly criticized the narrowness of Professor Deissmann's classification of the Christian letters. While fully agreeing with what he said in that paper, I feel only that he too readily admitted the German scholar's division into the two classes of letters and epistles, as if it were complete.

I. The Seven Churches Represent Groups.

In approaching the study of the Seven Letters, we have to observe first of all the fact that only seven are mentioned out of a larger number of Churches which must already have existed in Asia. Those Seven Churches must therefore have been selected for some reason, which we must try to understand, as being representative Churches.

For the reasons stated in the *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 295 f., we hold firmly to the date about A.D. 94, assigned by Irenaeus for the composition of the book. A date under Nero, which some scholars prefer, seems wholly irreconcilable with the character of the book. Even a date under Vespasian, for which Mr. Anderson Scott ably argues, though not so opposed to the spirit of the book, must be dismissed as causing more difficulties than it solves. But even at the earliest date which has been suggested for the composition of the Revelation, there were several other Churches in Asia which are not mentioned in the list. Some allusion to these will illustrate the main topic.

(1) Troas was the seat of a Church in A.D. 56, and was then the door through which access was open to other cities (2 Corinthians ii. 12, compare Acts xxi. 5 ff.). Its situation in respect of roads and communications made it a

specially suitable and tempting point of departure for evangelization: it was literally the door to the north-western part of Asia Minor, as is shown at length in Dr. Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. v. pp. 384 f., 389.

(2) Already during the residence of St. Paul in Ephesus, A.D. 54 to 56, "all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word" (Acts xix. 10). That would never have been recorded, except as an explanation of the spread of the new religion and the growth of numerous Churches.

(3) Already in A.D. 61 the Church of Colossae was the recipient of a letter from him, and a body of Christians, who must have constituted a Church, is mentioned at Hierapolis (Col. iv. 13). In this case it is evident that the three Churches of the Lycus valley were considered to stand in close relation to one another. They are very near, Hierapolis being less than six miles north, and Colossae eleven miles east, from Laodicea, and they are grouped together as standing equal in the affection and zeal of the Colossian Epaphras.. Any letter addressed to one of them was regarded apparently as common to the other two. This did not require to be formally stated about Laodicea and Hierapolis, which are in full view of one another on opposite sides of the glen; but St. Paul asks the Colossians to cause that his letter be read in the Church of the Loadiceans, and that ye likewise read the letter from Laodicea (Col. iv. 16).

(4) It may therefore be regarded as practically certain that the great cities which lay on the important roads connecting those seven leading cities with one another had all "heard the word," and that most of them were the seats of Churches, when these Seven Letters were written. We remember that, not long after, Magnesia and Tralleis, the two important, wealthy and populous cities on the road between Ephesus and Laodicea, possessed Churches of their own and bishops, that they both sent deputations to

salute, console and congratulate the Syrian martyr Ignatius, when he was conducted like a condemned criminal to face death in Rome, and that they both received letters from him. With these facts in our mind we need feel no doubt that those two Churches and many others like them took their origin from the preaching of St. Paul's coadjutors and subordinates during his residence in Ephesus, A.D. 54–56.

Magnesia inscribed on its coins the title "Seventh (city) of Asia," referring doubtless to the order of precedence among the cities as observed in the Common Council of the Province (*Κοινὸν Ἀσίας, Commune Asiae*).[1] This seems to prove that there was some special importance attached in general estimation to a group of seven representative cities in Asia, which would be an interesting coincidence with the Seven Churches. Of those seven cities five may be enumerated with practical certainty, viz. the three rivals, "First of Asia," Smyrna, Ephesus, and Pergamus, along with Sardis and Cyzicus. The remaining two seats were doubtless keenly contested between Magnesia, Tralleis (one of the richest and greatest in Asia), Alabanda (chief perhaps in Caria), Laodicea and Apamea (ranked by Strabo, p. 577, next to Ephesus as a commercial centre of the Province); but apparently at some time under the Empire a decision by the Emperor, or by a governor of the Province, or by the Council of Asia, settled the precedence to some extent and placed Magnesia seventh. Neither Thyatira nor Philadelphia, however, can have had any reasonable claim to a place among that "Seven."[1]

Further, it admits of no doubt that the letter to Laodicea was common to a group of at least three Churches. On the same analogy, doubtless, the other six Churches were addressed as representatives of six groups. Now, are we

[1] *Cities and Bish. of Phrygia*, ii. p. 429, where the mention of Philadelphia in a footnote should be deleted, as I have long recognized. At a later time, towards A.D. 200, both Thyatira and Philadelphia grew much wealthier, and were recognized by imperial favour as of higher importance,

to consider that the seven groups are a mere chance classification for this occasion only,—possibly dictated, as has been suggested, by the straining after the symbolism implied in the sacred number, seven—or that the grouping in seven bodies or associations of Churches had already some permanent and recognized existence in the organization of the Churches of the Province?

In this question, again, no long hesitation seems possible. Taking into consideration the creative and constructive capacity which the Christian Church showed from the beginning, and remembering that as early as A.D. 61 the two chief Churches of the Lycus valley (probably all three) were already regarded as common recipients of the letters addressed to one, we must infer that the consolidation of the three into a district had been completed before the Seven Letters were written. In a vigorous and rapidly growing body like the Church of the Province Asia, a fact was not likely to lie for a long time inactive, and then at last begin actively to affect the growth of the whole organism. Rather we must conceive the stages in the Christian history of the Lycus valley as being three: first, the natural union and frequent intercommunication of three separately founded, independent and equal Churches, as appears in A.D. 61: secondly, the equally natural growing pre-eminence before the eyes of the world of the leading city, Laodicea, so that letters which were addressed to one city were still intended equally for all, but Laodicea was the one that was almost inevitably selected as the representative and outstanding Church: thirdly, the predominance and presidency of Laodicea as the administrative head and centre amid a group of subordinate Churches.

How far this development had proceeded when the Seven Letters where written it is hardly possible to say with certainty. We can, however, feel very confident that the third stage had not yet been completely attained. The Seven

Letters afford no evidence on this point, except that, by their silence about any other Churches, they suggest that Laodicea was already felt to stand for and therefore to be in a way pre-eminent in its group; while, on the other hand, the spirit of the early Church seems to be inconsistent with the view that Laodicea had as yet acquired anything like headship or superiority. But the whole question as to the growth of a defined fixed hierarchy and order of dignity and authority among the Churches is obscure, and needs systematic investigation.[1]

What is true about Laodicea and its group must be applied to the rest of the Seven Churches. Each of them stands as representative of a group. Each of them is to be understood as in a certain degree pre-eminent, but probably hardly predominant, in its group. Each stood before the world as implying, without further mention, the whole group of which it was the centre.

II. Origin of the Seven Groups of Churches.

In this attempted specification of the relation between the Seven Churches and the groups for which they stand, it is implied that there was nothing like government or authority in the relationship. But, if that was so, how did these groups come into existence? Why did not all those Churches of Asia, equal as they probably were in standing and complete in authority and autonomy,[2] remain simply side by side without any representative Churches? There must have been some cause which produced that classification into groups with central representatives for each. We must now ask what was the principle that determined the selection

[1] Since the remarks in the text were printed I have seen Prof. Harnack's article in the *Berlin Akad. Sitzungsberichte*, 1901, p. 1186ff., which goes far to supply the want. It necessitates no alteration in what I have said.

[2] I mean complete in relation to one another. There can be no doubt that St. Paul as the founder (either immediate or through his subordinate ministers) continued always to hold authority over all alike; how far his authority was transmitted to a successor is uncertain.

of the Seven representative Churches, and what light, if any, that principle throws on the origin of the groups.

The first three, Ephesus, Smyrna, and Pergamus, are the three greatest and outstanding cities of the Province, which vied with one another for the title (claimed and used and boasted about by all) [1] of "First of Asia." This might suggest that the greatest and most important cities of the Province were selected as centres of the groups of Churches; and it is true that two among the remaining four, *viz.*, Sardis and Laodicea, were the heads of *conventus* (i.e. governmental districts for legal purposes), as were also the first three. But this principle breaks down completely in the case of Thyatira and Philadelphia, which were entirely secondary and second-rate cities, the latter in the *conventus* of Sardis, the former in that of Pergamus. The Seven Churches, therefore, were not selected because they were in the most important and influential cities; nor is the order of enumeration, with Ephesus, Smyrna, and Pergamus coming first, due to the fact that those were the three most important cities.

The late Dr. Hort has pointed the way to the true principle of selection in an excursus to his fragmentary, posthumously published edition of First Peter. In that excursus, which is a model of scientific method in investigation, he points out that the reason for the peculiar order in which the provinces are enumerated at the beginning of the Epistle lies in the route along which the messenger was

[1] In face of this and other similar, frequently quoted facts, it is quite extraordinary how modern scholars continue to repeat that Philippi could not be styled "first city" of its district (Acts xvi. 12), because that rank and title belonged to Amphipolis. Such an argument is a mere modernism, and possesses no meaning or validity when applied to the first century. Philippi as a Roman Colonia could not but be in a sense, and claim to be in every sense, "first in the district." Yet this striking piece of local truth is obscured by writer after writer, repeating that tralatitious error, which appears even in the otherwise excellent article on Philippi in Dr. Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*.

to travel, conveying the letter (perhaps in so many distinct copies) to the central cities of each province. Similarly, the Seven Churches are enumerated in the order in which a messenger from Patmos would reach them. He would land, of course, at Ephesus, then go north by the direct road (the oldest Roman road in the Province Asia, built about 130 B.C.) to Smyrna and Pergamus. Thence he would go along the great Imperial Post road[1] to Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea; and from Laodicea he would return along the Central Route of the Empire down the Maeander valley to the coast. These seven cities were the most suitable points for distributing the letters to the groups of Churches in the easiest way and the shortest time by seven other messengers, who (as we shall see) made secondary circuits from the seven representatives.

Now, it may be argued by some that this order simply suggested itself to the writer of the Seven Letters as convenient for this special case; and that argument cannot be absolutely and conclusively disproved, if any person should urge it. But those who properly weigh the indisputable facts above stated about the growth of the Laodicean district, as an example of the steady, rapid development of early Christian organization, must come to the conclusion that the writer of the Letters was not the first to make Laodicea the representative of a group of Churches, but found it already so regarded by general consent. Now what is true of Laodicea must be applied to the rest of the Seven Churches. In fact, if there were not such a general agreement as to the representative character of the Seven Churches, it is difficult to see how the writer could so entirely ignore the other Churches, and write to the Seven without a word of explanation that the letters were to be

[1] The names, Post Road and Central Route, are explained in an article *Routes and Travel in New Testament Times*, to be published in Dr. Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. v. pp. 375-402.

considered as referring also to the others. St. Paul, who wrote before that general agreement had been effected, carefully explained that his letter to Colossae was intended to be read also at Laodicea, and *vice versa*; but St. John assumes that no such explanation is needed.

Moreover, it seems clear that such a message as that in i. 11, "What thou seest write in a book and send unto the Seven Churches which are in Asia," is unintelligible unless those Seven were already marked out as representative of the Church of the Province. This seems to the present writer so conclusive a proof that he would rely on it alone without the foregoing long discussion; but opinions vary so widely as to the meaning of even the plainest passages in the New Testament that a more detailed argument has been drawn out.

Thus there stands out before us, about the last decade of the first century, a highly developed organization among the many Churches of the Province Asia—for they must have been many when so many groups existed, and other considerations, also, point decisively to that conclusion. In the preceding chapter of this study, the incalculable importance of the correspondence between the scattered Churches, as being the channel through which coursed the life-blood of the whole body, has been indicated; and the conclusion was reached that, since no postal service was maintained by the State for the use of private individuals or trading companies, "we find ourselves obliged to admit the existence of a large organization" for the transmission of the letters by safe Christian hands. Just as all the great trading companies maintained each its own corps of letter-carriers (*tabellarii*), so the Christians must necessarily provide for the carrying of their own letters, if they wanted to write; and this necessity must inevitably result, owing to the constructive spirit of that rapidly growing body, in the formation of a letter-carrying system. The routes of the

letter-carriers were fixed according to the most convenient circuits, and the provincial messengers did not visit all the cities, but only certain centres, from whence a subordinate service distributed the letters or news over the several connected circuits or groups.

Such is the barest outline of a kind of private postal service which must have had some analogy in the service constructed for itself by every wide-spread corporation in the Empire. The trading companies employed their own slaves; but it is clear that the Christians must have employed members of their own communities. The messengers went direct in each congregation to the *episkopos*, who was charged with the duty of hospitality as well as of correspondence (*Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 368).

Another important point to observe is that the Seven Cities were not selected simply because they were situated on the circular route above described, nor yet because they were the most important cities on that route. The messenger must necessarily pass through Hierapolis on his way from Philadelphia to Laodicea, and through both Tralleis and Magnesia on his way from Laodicea to the coast; all those three cities were indubitably the seats of Churches at that time; Tralleis and Magnesia were much more important and wealthy than Philadelphia or Thyatira; yet none of the three found a place among the representative cities. What then was the principle of selection?

As before, the answer lies in the convenience of epistolary communication. Those Seven Cities were the best points of communication with seven districts: Pergamus for the north (Troas, doubtless Adramyttium, and probably Cyzicus and other cities on the coast contained Churches): Thyatira for an inland district on the north-east and east: Sardis for the wide middle valley of the Hermus: Philadelphia for Upper Lydia, to which it was the door (iii. 8): Laodicea for the Lycus and the upper Maeander valleys, of

which it was the Christian metropolis in later time: Ephesus for the Cayster and Maeander valleys and coasts: Smyrna for the lower Hermus valley and the North Ionian coasts, with Mitylene and Chios (if those islands had as yet been affected).

In this list there is one marked omission. What about the great country of Caria, the hilly country south from the Maeander valley? The inevitable point of communication for that district would have been Tralleis, but Tralleis was not one of the representative Churches. The reason is clear. Caria lay apart from any of the great lines of communication: it was on the road to nowhere: any one who went south from the Maeander into the hilly country did so for the sake of visiting it, and not because it was on his best way to a more distant aim. Now the new religion spread with marvellous rapidity along the great routes; it floated free on the great currents of communication that swept back and forward across the Empire, but it was slower to make its way into the backwaters, the nooks and corners of the land: it penetrated where life was busy, thought was active, and people were full of curiosity and enterprise: it found only a tardy welcome among the quieter and less educated rustic districts. Hence Caria (except the lower Maeander valley with Miletus and other towns, for which Ephesus was the representative) was little disturbed in the old ways, when most of the rest of Asia was strongly permeated with Christianity. Hence, also, we have omitted from our list the part of Phrygia that lay south from Laodicea, even though through it a road of some importance led down to Perga and Attalia: any Church on that road would look to Laodicea as its representative, since Laodicea was its legal centre and the road-knot on the line of communication.

The only way to understand clearly this system of communication, and to realize how admirably adapted it is to

the situation, is to work it out on the map in view of the roads. A careful study of the circuits will throw some light on the diffusion of Christianity ; but that lies apart from our proper subject. It will, however, help to make the system clear if we discuss some other difficulties which are likely to suggest themselves.

The first is about Troas. Considering its importance as the doorway of North-Western Asia,[1] one might expect to find that it was one of the seven representative Churches. But a glance at the map will show that it could not be worked into the primary circuit of the provincial messenger, except by sacrificing the ease and immensely widening the area of his journey. On the other hand Troas comes in naturally on that secondary circuit which has Pergamus as its origin. The Pergamenian messenger followed the Imperial Post road through Adramyttium, Assos and Troas, along the Hellespont to Lampsacus. There the Post road crossed into Europe,[2] while the messenger traversed the coast road to Cyzicus, and thence turned south through Poimanenon and Hadrianotherai to the middle Caicus valley and down to Pergamus. This circuit is perhaps the most obvious and convincing of the whole series, as the account of the roads and towns on it in the *Historical Geography of Asia Minor* will bring out clearly.[3]

The second difficulty relates to Tralleis and Magnesia. As the primary messenger had to pass through them, why are they relegated to the secondary circuit of Ephesus? In the first place the messenger would reach them last of all, and long before he came to them the messenger on

[1] See above, p. 21.

[2] This was the Post road used when a purely land route was wanted ; otherwise the Post road crossed the sea between Troas and Neapolis (Acts xvi. 11 ; xx. 5).

[3] Unfortunately, the system of circuits is not described in the article on Roads and Travel in New Testament Times, mentioned above : the whole subject became clear as a result of the studies undertaken for that article, but not in time to be incorporated in it.

the Ephesian circuit would have reached them. But, secondly, a more important reason is that the primary circuit was not devised simply with a view to the Province of Asia. It was intended to be often conjoined with a further journey to Galatia and the East, so that the messenger would not return from Laodicea to the coast, but would keep on up the Lycus by Colossae eastwards.

Thirdly, either two incredibly large circuits must have started from Philadelphia and Laodicea, or else central and northern Phrygia must have been entirely left out of the system. Some would argue that, as Bithynia was so strongly permeated with the new religion, before 111 A.D., Phrygia which lies further south and nearer the original seats of Christianity, must have been Christianized earlier. This argument, however, ignores the way in which Christianity spread, *viz.*, along the main roads and lines of communication. The same cause, which made Caria later in receiving the new faith (as shown above), also acted in central and northern Phrygia. A study of the interesting monuments of early Christianity in that part of the country has shown that it was Christianized from Bithynia (probably not earlier than the second century)[1]; and it was therefore left out of the early Asian system, as being still practically a pagan country. Southern Phrygia lay near the main Central Route of the Empire, and its early Christian momuments show a markedly different character from the North Phrygian monuments, and prove that it was Christianized (as was obviously necessary) from the line of the great Central Highway. This part of Phrygia lay entirely in the upper Maeander valley, and fell naturally within the Laodicean circuit.

Eastern Phrygia, on the other hand, was Christianized

[1] See the EXPOSITOR 1888, October, pp. 263 ff.; the same views are put more clearly and precisely in *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, ii. pp. 510 f., 715.

from Iconium and Pisidian Antioch, and was therefore not included in the early Asian system which we have described. But during the second century, a complete provincial organization came into existence, and all Christian Asia was then united. But, as great part of Phrygia had for a long time been outside of the Asian system of the Seven Churches, it was at first sometimes thought necessary for the sake of clearness to mention Phrygia along with Asia in defining the Church of the whole Province. Hence we have the phrase "the Churches (or Brethren) of Asia and Phrygia" in Tertullian *adv. Prax.* 1, and in the letter of the Gallic Christians.

Thus we find that the Seven Letters are directed to a very well marked district embracing more than half of the province Asia; and natural features, along with indubitable epigraphic and monumental evidence, prove that the district of the Seven Letters contained the entire Asian Church as it was about the end of the first century. The importance of the Seven Letters becomes evident even in such a small though interesting matter as this.

III. The Letters address Single Churches.

In the fullest sense the Seven Churches are in these letters regarded as representative: they stand instead of the cities associated with them. The letters are addressed to them as individual Churches, and not to the groups for which they stand. The Seven Letters were written by one who was familiar with the situation, the character, the past history, the possibilities of future development, of those Seven Cities. The Church of Sardis, for example, is addressed as the Church of that actual, single city: the facts and characteristics mentioned are proper to it alone, and not common to the other Churches of the Hermus valley. Those others were not much in the writer's mind: he was absorbed with the thought of that one city: he saw

only death before it: it was a city of appearance without reality, promise without performance, outward show betrayed by careless confidence. But the other cities which were connected with it may be warned by its fate; and he that overcometh shall be spared and honoured. Similarly, Paul's letter to Colossæ was written specially for it alone, and not with reference to Laodicea; yet it was ordered to be communicated to Laodicea, and read publicly there also.

This singleness of vision is not equally marked in every case. In the message to Laodicea, the thought of the other cities of the group is more apparent; and perhaps the obscurity of the Thyatiran Letter, and the generality of the Ephesian, may be due in some degree to the outlook upon the other cities of their groups. Still even the Letter to Ephesus is, in at least one point, clearly marked with the character of the city. The Letter to Thyatira owes its obscurity in some degree to our almost complete ignorance of the special character of that city.

It is, undoubtedly, to this singleness of vision, the clearness with which the writer sees each single city, and the directness with which he addresses himself to each, that the remarkable variety of character in the whole series is due. The Letters were evidently all written together, in the inspiration of one occasion and one purpose; and yet how different each is from all the rest, in spite of the similarity of purpose and plan and arrangement in them all. The letter of St. Paul to the Ephesians, which is probably a letter intended equally for a whole group of Churches, and not directed to Ephesus as an individual Church, may be compared and contrasted with the Seven Letters.

To attain full consciousness of the individuality of the Seven Letters one should compare them with the letters of Ignatius to the five Asian Churches, Ephesus, Smyrna, Magnesia, Tralleis, Philadelphia, or with the letter of Clement to the Corinthian Church. Ignatius, it is true,

had probably seen only two of the five, and those only slightly: so that the vagueness, the generality, and the lack of individual traits in all his letters were inevitable. He insists on topics which were almost equally suitable to all Christians, or on those which not unnaturally filled his own mind in view of his coming fate.

But it is a remarkable fact that the more definite and personal and individual those old Christian letters are, the more vital and full of guidance are they to all other readers. The individual letters touch life most nearly; and the life of any one man or Church appeals most intimately to all men and all Churches.

The more closely we study the New Testament books and compare them with the natural conditions, the localities and the too scanty evidence from other sources about the life and society of the first century, the more full of meaning do we find them, the more strongly impressed are we with their unique character, and the more wonderful becomes the picture that is unveiled to us in them of the growth of the Christian Church. It is because they were written with the utmost fulness of vigour and life by persons who were entirely absorbed in the great practical tasks which their rapidly growing organization imposed on them, because they stand in the closest relation to the facts of the age, that so much can be gathered from them. They rise to the loftiest heights to which man in the fulness of inspiration and perfect sympathy with the Divine will and purpose can attain, but they stand firmly planted on the facts of earth. The Asian Church was so successful in moulding and modifying the institutions around it, because with unerring insight its leaders saw the deep-seated character of those Seven Cities, their strength and their weakness, as determined by their natural surroundings, their past history, and their national character.

W. M. Ramsay.

STUDIES IN THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN.

II.

The True Knowledge of God (*continued*).

Obedience is the school of love's perfecting. Out of love we obey rule, and by obeying learn to love better. Love is never brought to any height of perfectness in the family, human or Divine, where there are no strict commands to keep, no hard tasks to do, where all is ease, indulgence, and concession. There is, of course, a kind of strictness fatal to love; but there is another kind which is its guardian and true nurse. The most orderly households are, in general, the most affectionate, while the ill-governed and the disarrayed are rife with bickering and spite.

It is significant that the "keeping of commandments" of verses 3 and 4 has now become the "keeping of *His word*," ὃς δ' ἂν τηρῇ αὐτοῦ τὸν λόγον. The former are concentred, and yet broadened out, in the latter. The ἐντολαί are a part of the Divine λόγος, of that whole utterance in which God declares Himself to men and challenges their loving obedience. It is because they come as "God's word," as the expression of His mind and gracious will, and in the shape of His "word" articulate through human lips, that those commandments are effective and executive; in this form they come to possess the soul, to win the reason and affections, and to reproduce themselves, as by a resident and congenial power, within the nature of the child of God. Six times in this Epistle the phrase τηρεῖν τὰς ἐντολάς is repeated; only in this instance do we read τηρεῖν τὸν λόγον.

In John's Gospel, on the lips of Jesus, the latter ex-

pression predominates, "the word" being the message that He brings from God, of which He has so often to speak; ἐντολή(-αί) appears only in our Lord's final charge (John xiv. 15, 21, xv. 10), on the occasion of His giving specific and new injunctions to His disciples. Near in sense to this passage are the affecting words of the intercessory prayer of the Saviour in John xvii. 6 ff., where our Lord commends His disciples to the Father's protection as those "whom Thou hast given me," who "have kept thy word," and in consequence "have now come to know that all things whatsoever Thou hast given me are from Thee." Knowledge of the things of God, conveyed through Christ to His disciples, comes from and is of a piece with the faithful cherishing and obedient practice of God's word.

We have assumed the genitive in ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ to be *objective*; the "love of God" signifies the love that the keeper of His word has to God—not contrariwise, the love which God has for him. The whole drift of the context carries us to this rendering; the same relationship of this noun to its genitive appears in ii. 15 and v. 3; John xiv. 15, 31 illustrate from the words of Christ the infallible sequence by which the Christian keeping of commands follows from love toward Him from whom they proceed. In chap. iv. 9 the context points just as decisively the other way, interpreting "the love of God" as that which He has manifested toward us in the sending of His Son to save us; with St. Paul too the τοῦ Θεοῦ (or τοῦ Χριστοῦ) after ἀγάπη should always, it appears, be read subjectively. Nothing is gained by forcing the latter sense upon the locution in this passage; nor in iv. 12 (ἡ ἀγάπη αὐτοῦ), where the same alternative is presented and is decided by the same considerations. The middle course adopted by Haupt and Westcott, who balance the subjective and objective interpretations against each other, does not commend itself in either text. To paraphrase ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ as

"Divine love, love such as God feels," and not distinctly either that felt by God or toward God, is to introduce a subtle and exceptional rendering of a familiar phrase, and to drop the link of transition from *ἔγνωκα αὐτόν* (*ἡ γνῶσις*) to *ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ*, in which the force of the Apostle's implicit argument really lies.[1] The "perfecting" of our love to God by "love to one another," described in chap. iv. 11–14, is tantamount to its "perfecting" by the "keeping of God's word"; for the Divine message which St. John has received and constantly repeats, culminates here: this is, with him, the "old" and "new commandment," "the word which you had from the beginning" (*vv.* 7–11),—*ἀγαπητοί, ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους*.

3. In both these passages of the Epistle (ii. 5, 6, and iv. 11–14), to the love of God, which finds its scope and fulfilment in the keeping of His word, a great and immediate reward, a privilege of immeasurable worth, is assigned: *Abiding in God is the result of the true knowledge of Him*, —of the knowledge, that is, which works by love and is proved by obedience to command. So it follows in verse 5*b*, *γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐσμέν*; similarly, and by the like token, *γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ μένομεν*, in iv. 13. This constitutes the *κοινωνία*, the fellowship of man with God at which the whole Gospel aims (i. 3, 5); it is fellowship in its deepest and most absolute sense. Nay, it is more than communion, it is *union*. The *κοινωνία* thus distinguished is not the intercourse of two separate personalities external to each other, but of the creature with its Creator, of the finite knowledge and love with the infinite, the fellowship of the seeing eye with the light that fills the universe around it, of the living soul, the spark of kindled being in

[1] On this, as on some other leading points of grammatical interpretation Lücke, whose comparatively brief *Commentar über die Briefe des Evangelisten Johannes* (1836) is little known, shows a firmer grasp and a clearer judgement than the two great interpreters above named,

us, with the eternal Source, the all-comprehending element of life, the loving Will of God. The soul finds itself, in the consciousness of observant love toward God, occupied, encircled, and upheld by Him, as the bird in the air, as the ship on the ocean.

And in this recognition (*γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐσμέν*) the human heart for the first time enters into and properly feels its own existence: "in this we perceive that in Him *we exist*" (cf. Acts xvii. 28: the inversion *ἐν αὐτῷ ἐσμέν* emphasizes the *verbum essentiæ*). *ἐν αὐτῷ εἶναι* becomes in the next verse *ἐν αὐτῷ μένειν* (cf. iv. 13, *γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ μένομεν*); "abiding in God" is existence in God perpetuated; it is union made enduring, restful, secure. *μένειν* is one of St. John's key-words, learnt in its spiritual use from his Master (John viii. 31, xiv. 10, xv. 4 ff.); in this idea the aged Apostle's experience and disposition of mind show their stamp.[1] His life has long been hid with Christ in God. God is his soul's habitation. His thought, affection, will never move out of God, nor fix on any object in which God is not seen and His presence and direction realized. God is at the centre of every desire, at the spring of every impulse; God fills the circumference of outlook and of aim. God is "all things and in all" to the soul that loves Him with its whole self, that lives in the atmosphere and walks by the light of His word.

At the end of verse 5, reaching this conclusion, St. John's thought doubles back upon itself, repeating as if in an amended and ampler form the statement of verse 3. "Herein we know"—not simply (*v.* 3) "that we have known God" (as the Gnostic loved to say), nor "that we love God" (as the Christian prefers to say, and as the

1 The verb *μένειν* occurs oftener in St. John's Gospel and Epistles than in the whole New Testament besides. And the phrase *μένειν ἐν*, applied to spiritual objects (Christ, God, love, etc.), so conspicuously Johannine is only found in 1 Tim. ii. 15 and 2 Tim. iii. 14 elsewhere.

former part of verse 5 leads one to expect the writer's saying), but "that *we are in Him*." This Apostle's mind moves in ever-widening circles, and by Protean changes of expression in which the same substance takes incessantly new shapes and colours. Knowledge of God (*vv.* 3, 4) is restated as "love of God" in verse 5; and where "love of God" should have been repeated, this gives place in turn to the idea of "being" and "abiding in God." Fellowship (i. 3, etc.) divides itself into knowledge and love (ii. 3, 4), and these recombine in this enriched conception of a fellowship through which the human spirit finds its home, its ground and sphere of being for evermore in the Divine.

The thought of man's abiding in God has its complement and counterpart, as the Apostle indicates in the parallel context, in that of God's abiding in him: ἐν αὐτῷ μένομεν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν ἡμῖν (iv. 13, 16); for God tenants the believing and loving soul, while He enfolds it. The bird is in the air; but the air too is in the bird filling breast and wings, and gives it the power to rise and soar in the kindred element. If this correlative side of the truth of Divine fellowship is not expressed here, the reason is that St. John in confuting the false pretenders to religious knowledge is concerned for the present with the marks of the genuine Christian state as these appear from the human side and as they are verified in the experience of himself and his children in the faith. In such men three tokens are found, obedience and love, resulting in a conscious dwelling in God (ἐντολῶν τήρησις, ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ, and ἐν αὐτῷ εἶναι, μένειν); and these three are one.[1]

4. Finally, verse 6 sets up *the standard of the life of*

1 Bengel analyses verses 3–6*a* somewhat differently, as though into three stages of progress, ἐγνωκέναι αὐτόν, εἶναι ἐν αὐτῷ, μένειν ἐν αὐτῷ—"cognitio, communio, constantia."

Divine fellowship which is furnished by the history of Jesus Christ. That knowledge of God by which the soul dwells in Him, cleaving to Him in love and doing always the things that please Him, belonged to one amongst men in its perfect measure. In Him, if in no other, "the love of God has been perfected" in the constant keeping of His word: "I have kept my Father's commandments," said Jesus, "and abide in His love." Hence He claimed in His debate with "the Jews" to possess the knowledge of the Father that was lacking to them, the want of which made their religious life so hollow and futile. "It is my Father," He protested, "that glorifieth me, of whom you say that He is your God, and you have not known Him (*οὐκ ἐγνώκατε αὐτόν*; cf. *vv.* 3, 4 above). But *I* know Him; and if I should say, 'I know Him not,' I shall be like you, a liar; but I do know Him, and I keep His word" (John viii. 54, 55). The secret of the Lord was with Jesus, when the spiritual guides of His people had altogether lost it: a gracious, loving temper, a lowly purity of heart and utter selflessness, a calm and clear insight into the will of God—these were signs in Him, to which the character of His impugners presented a melancholy opposite, of the intimacy with the Father in which He lived and wrought. If He was in this respect a true witness, the Jewish leaders who challenged Him were "liars."

Now, St. John, meeting the Gnostics at the end of the Apostolic age, sees the situation of Jesus and the Rabbis of Jerusalem virtually reproduced. These men also "say" of God, "I have known Him" (*v.* 4); they "say that they abide in Him" (*v.* 6); their high pretensions and air of wisdom and authority impose on simple minds. "But look at their lives," the Apostle says: "do they walk *as He walked?*"

It is a formidable criterion that the Gospel record thus supplies for application to the title of those who come in

Christ's name. But the criterion is one from which His representatives may not shrink. "I have left you an example," our Master said, "that you should do as I have done unto you,"—"by this shall all men know that you are my disciples"; and if this example be not followed, and the spirit and trend of our life bear in a direction quite away from His, men are justified in drawing the opposite inference. The example may be, and sometimes is, misapplied, through narrowness or ill-will; a formal and mechanical construction is put upon it when the imitation of Jesus is made to consist in the reproduction of outward details and particular traits of the Blessed Life, which were determined by His social environment and His personal mission. The essential character of His "walk" and its exemplary power are lost in the attempt to grasp it in its comparatively superficial features. But whatever difficulties and limitations attach to the use of this model, it remains the perfect pattern of a holy humanity, the ideal of the religious life made practicable and practised before our eyes, the creed actualized and rendered into flesh and blood—breathing, walking, living, dying, rising again in this realistic form stamping itself upon its votaries, who cannot hold it as notional believers and by way of intellectual assent or conventional observance, if indeed they believe that Jesus lived and died, the Word made flesh, living out the life of God in the soul and body of a man! One cannot merely accept the doctrine of Jesus without the responsibility of following the *walk* of Jesus. By this touchstone St. John exposed the grandiose spiritual pretensions of contemporary Gnosticism. By it the true and the false gospel are normally to be distinguished. That type of faith is nearest to the faith of Jesus which produces in the greatest number, and of the finest quality, men like Jesus, who "walk even as He walked."

The ἐκεῖνος of this sentence is, in rationally grammatical

propriety, another person from the αὐτός. The writer's idea is not that if one dwells in Christ one must *walk* in Christ (cf. for instance Gal. v. 25), but that if one dwells in God, one will walk *like Jesus*; that Christ is in fact the pattern of the true life in God. It is not consistency with ourselves, conformity of practice and profession, that the Apostle enjoins, but conformity of both to Jesus Christ. If you abide in God, you will love God and keep His word in the very way that the Lord Jesus did; your knowledge of God will thus prove itself to be of the same order, and to have the like contents with the human knowledge of the Father that Jesus possessed, and out of which He lived His life amongst men. As He held His earthly existence consciously in God and for God, so it should be with ourselves who profess His faith, who present to the world His gospel and represent Him on its behalf.

At later turns in the Epistle the writer commends two features of the walk of Jesus in particular to the imitation of his readers. In chapter iii. 3, its *purity*: πᾶς ὁ ἔχων τὴν ἐλπίδα ταύτην ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἁγνίζει ἑαυτὸν καθὼς ἐκεῖνος ἁγνός ἐστιν, "Every one that has this hope set on him, purifies himself as He is pure." ἁγνεία is a virgin purity, a chastity of soul, such as marks a nature not merely clear of (cleansed from) moral defilement (καθαρός: see John xv. 3), but wholly remote from it, and that shrinks from contamination by a delicate and instinctive repugnance. This more positive purity, this richer and finer strain of moral virtue, shone throughout the walk of Jesus Christ; and He breathes it with His Spirit into those who walk with Him.[1]

Furthermore, in the 16th verse of the third chapter, the crowning act of the earthly course of Jesus is adduced for imitation: "In this we have come to know love

[1] Cf. 1 Peter i. 22, where the same verb is applied to the character "new born" in men who had aforetime "walked ἐν ἀσελγείαις, ἐπιθυμίαις, κ.τ.λ." (iv. 3): τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ἡγνικότες ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας . . . ἀναγεγεννημένοι.

(ἐγνώκαμεν τὴν ἀγάπην), in that He (ἐκεῖνος) for us laid down His life (soul, τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ); and we ought for the brethren to lay down our lives." Both there and here ὀφείλω expresses the obligation stated (ὀφείλει . . . καὶ αὐτὸς περιπατεῖν, v. 6; ὀφείλομεν . . . τὰς ψυχὰς τιθέναι, iii. 16); this verb presents the duty as something that we *owe* (see Luke xvii. 10), a personal obligation which we have contracted to God and to our brethren, under the relations in which we are placed to both by our Lord Jesus Christ. There is more incumbent on us in the following of Jesus than the copying of an example; it is the discharge of our debt. We do not simply see the beauty of Christ's self-devotion, the ideal purity of His spirit and life, and set ourselves, for our own sake and out of admiration and moral aspiration, to the task of reproducing His lineaments. We are no volunteers or amateurs in the quest; nay, but "necessity is laid upon us" (1 Cor. ix. 16), and we are not free to do otherwise.

Every step of that lovely "walk" of Jesus, which so enthrals us, was taken in the path of man's salvation, toward the goal of our redemption by His blood. By treading this pathway to the end—a course of self-sacrifice, self-inanition, from first to last—Jesus Christ has established the strongest of claims upon us and has become in fact our Lord; we are not our own any more—we "were bought at a price" (1 Cor. vi. 20); He has "purchased unto God with His blood men of every tribe and tongue . . . and made them unto our God a kingdom and a company of priests" (Rev. v. 9, 10). To state the same principle again, in St. Paul's words: "He died for all, that the living should no longer live to themselves, but to Him who for their sakes died and rose again"—that they might be "imitators of God as beloved children, and walk in love as Christ also loved us, and gave up Himself an offering and a sacrifice to God,

for an odour of sweet smell" : to this kind of walk "the love of Christ constraineth us" (2 Cor. v. 15; Eph. v. 1, 2); and the career of Jesus Christ does not afford His brethren merely an exterior copy, but an interior compulsive and assimilative force. Christ is to be "formed in" us; and till this is accomplished, the Apostles travail as in birth over their children—ὠδίνω ἄχρις οὗ μορφώθῃ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν (Gal. iv. 19). Only by virtue of this experience is the Christian a Christian indeed; then at last, when we are conformed to the image of God's Son, we truly "*keep* the word of God," and "love is made perfect with us, that we may have boldness in the day of judgement, because as *He is* (καθὼς ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν) we too are in this world" (iv. 17).

The present tense of the verb τιθέναι, used in chap. iii. 16 of the Christian's "laying down his life for the brethren" and illustrated by St. John's protracted years of selfless ministry, shows that he was not thinking of martrydom, nor of any single exemplary act of self-devotion for Christ's sake, but of the sustained activity of a Christian life, in which self is habitually merged in the service of God's kingdom and the soul daily laid out and spent upon the highest good of mankind, after the fashion of Jesus Christ.

This sacrificial aspect and direction of his Master's walk dominated everything else in the Apostle's remembrance of Him ; it coloured and determined every detail in the course of imitation which he pursued, and in which he is leading his little children. "The Father hath sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world," hath sent Him "into the world that we might live through Him" (iv. 9–14) ; and Jesus had said, in words never absent from His Apostle's thoughts, "As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you" (John xx. 21). In the walk of Jesus the end determined the way; the cross threw its shadow back as far as Bethlehem—and farther still, into all the preparings and

prophesyings of His advent. And it throws its shadow forward upon all the issues and the followings thereof. The man who "walks even as He walked," moves onward to that goal.

GEORGE G. FINDLAY.

A REPLY TO DR. DENNEY.

It is with deep reluctance that I answer Dr. Denney's strictures[1] on my review of his volume *The Death of Christ*, in the *Primitive Methodist Quarterly Review*. Controversy is rarely congenial, and with a scholar so eminent and esteemed it is most distasteful, all the more so in view of the large agreement that underlies our sharp divergence. Had it been simply my competence to interpret Paul that was in question, I should have cheerfully left it to take care of itself, nor have obtruded on an uninterested world the impertinence of self-vindication. But the point at issue is of far graver moment, and though I dread to encroach further on time already curtailed by illness and mortgaged with pledges unredeemed, it is my duty to defend my interpretation, rather than let the case go by default. Not, of course, that I hope to convince Dr. Denney. He has that happy temperament which is not clouded by misgivings as to the soundness of his conclusions, and which airily brushes aside views that do not appeal to him as meaningless or fantastic, or things not to be taken seriously, a temper of mind which has made it hard for me to learn from him so much as I could have wished. But since many will no doubt take it for granted that so distinguished a writer must have ample justification for his strong language about me, I would remind them of facts that may prevent too blind an acceptance of his verdict. I may be permitted to add that the discussion has arisen in an unfortunate way. In a necessarily brief review I could do no more than indicate my objections, without expounding my views at length, to say nothing of defending them. And I was writing for those,

[1] In the Expositor for October 1903, republished with slight modifications in a little volume bearing the title *The Atonement and the Modern Mind* (Hodder and Stoughton; 1903).

who, for the most part, were already familiar with them from articles and reviews.[1] Perhaps a fuller exposition may throw light on the question whether Dr. Denney has altogether caught my meaning.

I am not here concerned with Prof. Denney's attempt to commend his theory of the Atonement to the modern mind, but simply with the interpretation of the Pauline doctrine. The question on which he explicitly joins issue with me is that of the racial character of Christ's act, but he does so tacitly in reference to the doctrine of union with Christ, on which I criticised him not merely in reviewing his work on *The Death of Christ*, but also in my notice of his *Studies of Theology*. It is with these fundamental questions that I wish to deal.

The objections urged against the former view seem to be that the idea of a racial act is absurd in itself, "a fantastic abstraction"; that even were it rational, it would not be applicable to Christ's work; that Paul never meant anything of the kind, or, as Dr. Denney rather tartly puts it, "I own I can see nothing profound in it except a profound misapprehension of the Apostle"; and that it "is in principle to deny the whole grace of the gospel, and to rob it of every particle of its motive power," a sweeping assertion to which I hardly think Prof. Denney would adhere in cold blood. No wonder that I am selected as the drunken Helot of the representative view. I readily understand that with the hard common sense, that gives so much strength to his

[1] I much regret that I cannot refer Dr. Denney to more that I have published on the subject. He could find a sketch of my views in my *Guide to Biblical Study* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1897), pp. 194–219, and more briefly in my *Hebrews* in the *Century Bible* (T. C. & E. C. Jack: 1902) pp. 30–33: also in an article on *The Permanent Value of the Pauline Theology* in *Present Day Papers*, July 1900. My commentary on Colossians in the *Expositor's Greek Testament* was completed in 1898, but owing to the delay in the publication of the volume, has not yet appeared. My detailed discussions of Paulinism exist at present only in MS., or have been printed or private circulation.

treatment of these questions, and his almost fanatical dislike of mysticism, the very idea of a racial act should seem to him a fantastic abstraction. Keen-sighted as he is on many sides, he appears, if I also may practise an engaging frankness, to be colour-blind to one realm of Pauline ideas. The fact that he sees nothing profound in the conception makes me sorry, but it does not in the least disturb me. It is hardly worth while discussing the validity of our impressions: I must be content, as Kuenen said of Nöldeke, to let my denial stand against his assertion. It is more promising to discuss the question whether Paul has the conception of a racial act. This precedes the question whether he so interpreted the act of Christ. A strong case can, I think, be made out for the view that he had such a conception in relation alike to Adam and to Christ.

We cannot hope to interpret Paul's doctrine of Christ's work, unless we give prominence to his parallel between Adam and Christ. Their relation to the race conditions so vitally the effects of their acts upon the race, that we should seek first of all to determine what that relation is. It is singularly fortunate that Paul has done so much to help us here in Romans v. 12–21, and in 1 Corinthians xv. The former passage is obscure and elliptical, and radically divergent views of its true interpretation may be taken. Still it yields us much that is really unambiguous, and much as to which a probable decision may be reached. It would be a disastrous error to infer from its somewhat parenthetical character that the parallel was little more to Paul than a passing illustration, by which he sets forth the greatness of Christ's work. What has suggested this has been the incompatibility of his statements with history as we understand it. But that need not disturb his most ardent admirer, for his interest was not historical but psychological. The passage is one of the most fundamental in his Epistles, and ought to be set in the forefront of any exposition of Christ's

work. In his exposition of the soteriology of Romans in *The Death of Christ* Dr. Denney simply ignores it.[1] I am not surprised; yet if we wish to know in virtue of what the work of Christ effected its results, it is with it that we must begin. And within certain limits we can control the interpretation of one side of the parallel by reference to the other, while much help is afforded by 1 Corinthians xv.

In spite of all that scholars have urged against the view that by the words "because all sinned" Paul meant because all sinned in the sin of Adam, I cannot convince myself that this interpretation is mistaken. It is hard to explain the words of personal sin. Even if we waive some of the objections usually urged against this view, others cannot easily be set aside. The stress throughout the passage lies not on the acts of all the individuals who constitute the race, but on the acts of Adam and Christ. "Through one that sinned," "through one trespass," "through one man's disobedience," such is the constant refrain. In fact, Paul practically says that all sinned in Adam when he says "Through one man's disobedience the many were constituted sinners." He does definitely attribute the death of all to the sin of Adam in the words "by the trespass of the one the many died," with which we may compare the words "death reigned through the one," and "as in Adam all die." The most natural interpretation of *vv.* 13, 14 supports this view. They explain the thought in Paul's mind that universal death is due, not to the personal sin of those who die, but to their sin in Adam, by pointing out that in the non-legal period, when sin could not be imputed since there was no transgression, there, nevertheless, was universal death. As death was the penalty of transgression, and as in a non-legal condition transgression cannot arise, this uni-

[1] I do not need to be reminded that Dr. Denney has published a commentary on Romans. That did not prevent him from discussing the great passage in Rom. iii., in his *Death of Christ*.

versal prevalence of death from Adam to Moses must be explained as due to Adam's trespass. Since then it is assigned both to the sin of Adam and to the sin of all, and the latter cannot be personal sin, the only conclusion possible is that the sin of Adam is the sin of all. The aorist is therefore to be interpreted as in 2 Corinthians v. 14. Moreover, if we do not let our clue slip from our fingers in treading the mazes of this labyrinth, we are bound to give a scope to the words analogous to that which suits the parallel act of Christ. Now if Paul attributed a man's death to his personal sin, he must, in accordance with this principle, have attributed that which cancelled the death to his personal righteousness. But I think it will be granted that he assigned it to the act of Christ. I may add, as throwing light on the phrase "as through one man sin entered into the world," that Paul explains the phrase "by man came death" by the phrase "in Adam all die" (1 Cor. xv. 21, 22).

If, then, the act of Adam is also the act of the race, it may be correctly described as a racial act. It is necessary, however, to fix the meaning of this more precisely, and show that it is no "fantastic abstraction." There is no need to discuss the strange view of Tertullian and other theologians that the soul of every member of the race was seminally present in Adam and participated in his act; that would be really fantastic. Nor does the popular view that the whole destinies of the race hung on the mere accident of an individual choice do any kind of justice to Paul's magnificent synthesis. This paltry interpretation would make the universe the sport of caprice. If Adam acts for the race, it is because he faithfully represents it. In his act there come to expression and to judgment tendencies universal in the race. It is not Paul's thought that with the act of Adam there steals into the race a subtle poison, it is rather that in his act the poison already there begins its deadly work. For he acts for us not in spite of difference

from us, but in virtue of a community of nature with us. "As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy." And if the question be raised in what this identity of principle consists, I have no doubt (the phrase "sin entered into the world" notwithstanding), that it is to be sought in the possession by Adam from the first of our sinful flesh, and Romans v. 12–21 must be read in the light of vii. 7–25. When the commandment came, the sin that slumbered in it leapt to consciousness and revolt. And since he acted as every individual in his place would have acted, his act is fitly regarded as one which reveals the true character of the race. Thus it loses its individual and gains a racial significance. It transcends the narrow limits of personal experience, and becomes the august and ominous act of Man. In him the whole race is on its trial, and fails to stand the test. Thus the race is judged and declared to be sinful: "Through one man's disobedience the many were constituted sinners." And if I am told that this is to make sin inevitable, I answer that we need not be afraid to call things by their right names. It was not we who placed our representative there, but that God "who hath shut up all unto disobedience that He might have mercy upon all." From the racial act and its consequences the whole element of personal choice is eliminated. The race as a race is by God adjudged to be sinful, and the penalty imposed is physical death. In this conception of a racial act I own that I see no "fantastic abstraction." It is not more fantastic than Romans viii. 19–21 or Ephesians i. 10, or the thought of the Church as Christ's bride, which is said to be "a great mystery."

But man, caught in the coils of his own earthy nature, and helpless to release himself from the grip of its folds, is not abandoned to their strangling embrace. If there is a natural order, there is a spiritual order as well; and though that order does not assert itself till the natural has

had time to display its baneful character under the stimulus of the Law, yet in the fulness of time it breaks into the world in the Incarnation of God's Son. It was not we who placed Him where He stands in history, once more it was God, who sent His Son and constituted Him our second racial Head. Over against the weak and sinister figure of the First rises the gracious and mighty figure of the Second Adam. Standing where He does, His acts, too, lose their individual and gain a racial significance. In His death the race dies and atones for its sin, is pronounced righteous by God, and therefore the physical death which fell on the race as the penalty of its act in Adam, is cancelled by the universal resurrection of the body." [1]

All this could be inferred from the parallel of the first with the second Man. But Paul does not leave us to inference. In 2 Corinthians v. 14, he says explicitly, " We thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died." The meaning of this can only be that all men died in the death of Christ, that His was a racial act. And this receives light from the words " Even so through one act of righteousness [it came] unto all men to justification of life." The Apostle

[1] There are passages in Paul which do not seem to favour a universal resurrection (e.g. Rom viii. 11, 1 Cor. xv. 23). But his argument in Rom. v. 12–21 would go to pieces if he anticipated a limited resurrection. The whole point of it is that the last Adam cancels, and much more than cancels, the effects of the first Adam's act. One of those effects was the physical death of each individual, and universal death cannot be cancelled by a limited resurrection. Paul draws the inference explicitly in 1 Cor. xv. 22, " In Christ shall all be made alive." The use of " in Christ " here with a racial, not with its usual personal, application is very noteworthy. There is no reference in this passage to universal salvation (whether there are any such passages in Paul is irrelevant here). But it is relevant to point out that if we are determined to give " death " in Rom. v. 12–21 more than a physical signficance, we shall not be able to stop short of universalism. The act of Adam involves no change in the ethical constitution of man, it simply reveals what that constitution is. There is a change in ethical status, for the nature cannot be judged sinful till it has found expression in an overt act. No effects follow from Adam's act for the individual, except that God regards him as of a sinful nature and that he is subject to physical death.

means that in contrast to the judgment passed on the race through the trespass of Adam, which resulted in the universal reign of death, the race is now pronounced righteous as a race, and this justification issues in the resurrection of all the units who compose it. Thus, in virtue of the fact that "the last Adam became a life-giving Spirit," "by man came the resurrection of the dead," and in Christ all are made alive. It seems at first sight strange that in Romans v. 19 the aorist on the one side of the parallel should have a future as its counterpart. We should have expected Paul to say: "As through the transgression of one man the many were constituted sinners, so also through the obedience of the one the many were constituted righteous." But the eschatological interest mingles with the current of his thought (so also in verse 17), and he is looking forward to the resurrection when this justification of the race shall be made manifest to all. We need, therefore, have no hesitation in believing that it was not because he shrank from completing the parallel begun in Romans v. 12 that he wholly omits the second part of it. In a way not unusual with him, he leaves the track of his argument, to clear up a point raised by what he has just said. Had he completed it, we may feel sure that it would have run something like this: "So through one man life entered into the world, and life through righteousness; and so life passed to all men, because all were righteous." All this makes it plain that Paul's thought is not moving in the sphere of individual, but in the sphere of racial action. For while he insisted that all personally sinned, and thus by making Adam's act their own justified the treatment of it as a racial act, he certainly could not have said that all were personally righteous. And in the one act, as in the other, the element of choice on the part of men generally is wholly absent. That they belong to a race judged guilty or declared righteous, that they experience physical

death or resurrection, these are facts which happen without any reference to their individual will.

But here a difficulty emerges. If the possession by Adam of our common nature constitutes him our fit representative and confers on his deed a racial character, does not the parallel between Adam and Christ break down at a crucial point? Adam is the natural man, his essential significance is that he stands for human nature left to itself. The more perfectly he represents us, the less appropriate does it seem that we should be represented by Christ. In the consideration of this point I omit for the present any reference to the question of the relation between the pre-incarnate Christ and humanity. But can we discover other points of contact? We must not forget that the natural man is not wholly evil. The flesh, indeed, is intrinsically sinful, and it is seized by sin as its base of operations. But there is also the higher nature, which Paul identifies with the man's true self (Rom. vii. 17, 20). For the flesh, while an original, is not destined to be a permanent constituent of human nature, and is therefore an accident of the self, however closely it may seem at times to be identified with it (e.g. Rom. vii. 14). Man's condition is one of slavery to an alien power, against which his true nature chafes in vain. Now in so far as Christ represents the true essential self, He may be regarded as our representative, even though the accidental element of "the flesh" be absent.

Of course, it may be fairly debated whether Paul really made this exception, but into this extremely difficult question of the ethical constitution of Christ it is not necessary to enter. And I do not think that the term "representative" is adequate here; so that when Dr. Denney selects my words as the extreme example of the representative theory, he has read them in a sense I

did not mean to convey. It is a stronger term than representation that we need, I think it should be identification. Christ becomes so completely one with us that His acts become ours. When I say that the formula "Christ died in our stead" has a certain element of truth, but that it would be more correct to say that in Him the guilty race suffered and died, I mean that the victim of Calvary was not simply an individual, though the Son of God, but that He was humanity. To our eyes, which stop with the external, and cannot penetrate behind to the essential fact, it is Jesus who dies in our stead; and it is true that so far as He suffers, in His own individual personality, if I may put it so, what we deserved, His suffering may be correctly described as vicarious. But since He and the race are joined in indissoluble union, His acts are the acts of the race. There is, so to speak, a *communicatio idiomatum* between Christ and mankind. The interest of a merely vicarious theory is to insist on the sharp distinction between Christ and the race, my interest is to identify them as closely as possible. It is quite natural that Paul should speak in terms proper to the external fact, and he does so constantly, but this should not blind us to the principle which he detected beneath it.

May I not carry the exposition of this principle a step further? A new light falls on the perplexing problem of the world's pain. Since Christ and the race are one, the sufferings of humanity become His own. No act of violence or oppression, no sickness or bereavement, no horror of great darkness, no anguish of love rebuffed, nor the deeper anguish for the sin of those we love, but He endures it and keenly feels its uttermost pang. Ideally concentrated in a single experience, actually His suffering is co-extensive with the life of Man; He gathers into His own agony all our unnumbered woes. By becoming His own pain it gains a redemptive efficacy. Thus we know

that it is not meaningless, but that all our sufferings are pressed into the service of the Titanic warfare that He wages with evil, and are working together for good to all who love God.

Now all this does not mean that the race redeems itself, as that proposition would be commonly understood, and as Dr. Denney understands it. The natural man at the best cannot redress the balance of good and evil, of mind and flesh, even in himself. He cannot atone for his own transgression, or break the power of sin in his own life. Not all his plunging and struggling can free him from the web in which he is snared ; each effort for victory leaves him with spent energies and a new defeat. Humanity has in it no resources for the tremendous conflict, nor did it produce the Champion who has won its battle. We cannot point to Christ (as we can to Shakespeare in the realm of poetry) as the flower of the race in goodness, to show that we can confront God with Him and prove in doing so our moral excellence. It is because He Himself has taken the initiative, and planted Himself in the race, that one with Him it can boldly approach God. It is not our sufferings that avail anything in themselves, but our sufferings transmuted into the sufferings of Christ.

Were this the occasion, I might go further still and point out that even the term "racial" is too narrow to express Paul's thought. But it lies outside the present discussion to expound his great doctrine of the cosmic sweep of the redemptive forces. I must, however, touch on the solitary argument with which Dr. Denney repels the idea of a racial act. It is that we are, to begin with, apart from Christ (Eph. ii. 12). Dr. Denney might not now urge this against my own view, after the statement I have just given of it. But he seems to me rather easily satisfied, for I think the passage is irrelevant against what he supposed to be my view, and that, whether we take

χωρὶς Χριστοῦ as parallel to the following clauses or not. If Paul means that when his readers were without Christ they were alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, he simply says that in their pre-Christian state as individuals they were so alienated. The phrase is one that might naturally be used to describe the condition of any one who was not "in Christ," an unconverted man, without raising the wholly remote question whether the person so described belonged to a race with which Christ was connected. This may quite well be the meaning of the phrase if it is parallel to the clauses that follow. But I am inclined to suggest that in this case the sense is rather different. Paul is describing his readers when they were unconverted Gentiles, and contrasting their alienation from Israel with the union now effected by Christ. If we remember this, and then read "ye were apart from Christ, estranged from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers to the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world," the clause in question gets a new light, both from the parallel clauses and the general context. This, as well as the other phrases, expresses the Gentiles' lack of a privilege possessed by the Jews. Accordingly, even though "Christ" is here a personal name, it retains very strongly a suggestion of its official meaning, they were "without Messiah." In any case the words seem wholly unadapted to the purpose for which Dr. Denney has quoted them.

But this is a mere negative result, and since Dr. Denney has not thought it worth while to treat the question seriously, I must bring forward positive arguments to show that Christ is ours to begin with. There is one passage that many might expect me to employ which I must leave aside, 1 Corinthians xv. 47. In spite of the wide acceptance of the "heavenly-man" theory, I have never been able to believe that we should translate "the second is the man

from heaven," since the balance of clauses would be disturbed, as the first clause cannot well be translated otherwise than "The first man is of the earth, earthy. *Ἄνθρωπος* in the second clause can as little be separated from *ὁ δεύτερος* as from *ὁ πρῶτος* in the first, and we must translate "the second man is of heaven." On the clause so translated we cannot safely build the theory in question. I may be permitted to diverge from the discussion of Paul's doctrine, to point out that Dr. Denney's assertion seems to be in conflict with the Epistle to the Hebrews. A careful scrutiny of Hebrews ii. 11–17 reveals, I think, that the author regarded the *pre-incarnate* Son as the brother of men, who, because He was already their brother, sharing a common origin with them and not disdaining to own His kinsfolk in their misery, took on Him their flesh and blood and was "made in all things like His brethren." Returning to Paul, we must remember the cosmic significance he assigns to Christ. All created beings, even in the highest orders, were created in Him, and find in Him their centre of cohesion. I will not press this, since it might seem too general, just as passages like "He chose us in Him before the foundation of the world" are too narrow. But I think we may press the words "the head of every man is Christ" (1 Cor. xi. 3), for they appear to assert not only Christ's universal headship of the race, but a headship "to begin with." Indeed, it would not otherwise be easy to account for the position assigned to Him as "the second man" or "the last Adam." Paul lays great stress on the fact that it is as *man* that Christ achieves His work (Rom. v. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 21, 47). Why this man should do what no other has achieved, is explained by the fact that He is the Son of God. But the capacity in which He acts is that of spiritual Head of the race. The fact of His spiritual nature necessitates the development in Romans v. 12-21 from parallel to contrast. For Adam is just the mere natural man, the passive

victim of his nature. But Christ is a life-giving spirit, whose vitalizing energies are communicated to those with whom He has become one. And so there rings through the passage that great "much more"; so, while one side of the parallel is interpreted in terms of representation, the other is interpreted in terms of identification.

Were I formally expounding Paul's doctrine, it would be necessary at this point to come to close quarters with the crucial problem, and ask precisely in what did he conceive the redeeming work to lie, what it was that gave the acts done or experiences endured a redemptive quality, and what were the effects produced by them. But this lies outside my special purpose. I will simply say that Dr. Denney would do well to bring out as clearly as possible the difference between his "substitution" theory and theories which commonly go by that name; and I must express my horrified dissent (if it is not rude to say so) from his estimate of Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo.*

And now I must come to the second great question at issue between us—that of union with Christ. I am thankful that we can start from the common ground that Paul has much to say of union with Christ. But while I, with many others, believe that this union is of a mystical character, Dr. Denney affirms that the New Testament knows only a moral union. He is afraid that we may lose ourselves in soaring words, and thinks that the idea of a mystical union approaches the region of the unintelligible. Well, "the race of flame soars high," and I am not frightened of soaring words. In truth no other words will do. There are elements in Paulinism of which one cannot write adequately, unless he writes with rapture. Nor must we be deterred by dread of the unintelligible. With the irrational we can, of course, make no terms. But when a great speculative genius speaks of the dim and darkly

guessed regions, where personality has its roots, and where our spirits know the thrill and shock of contact with the Divine, we must expect the facts he reports to us to be largely beyond our comprehension. When Dr. Denney urges further that our death to sin and resurrection to a new life with Christ, is something we have to realize in the course of our Christian life, I am entirely at one with him. Here again, what is ideally concentrated in a single experience is actually achieved in a process. "Therefore" in Colossians iii. 5 is very instructive in this respect. But it is desirable to expound Paul's doctrine in its absolute form first, and thus disengage the principles in it, in a pure and not in a mixed form. Moreover, the fact that the union only gradually becomes complete is quite irrelevant to our present question whether it is moral or mystical.

It strikes me in the first place as strange that if Paul meant a moral union merely, he should have hit upon such a term as "in Christ" to express it. Our word "union" is itself rather ambiguous, but I should not describe the fact that my will was in harmony with Christ's will, that I passed the same moral judgments and sought the same ends, as a union with Christ in the strict sense at all. I could have precisely the same moral harmony with any of my fellows, but I should not dream of expressing this by saying that I was "in him." As Dr. Denney explicitly mentions the phrase "in Christ," and yet affirms that nothing more than a moral union is meant, it would be wasted labour to discuss this further. But there are other phrases where this interpretation seems not simply unlikely but impossible. When Paul says, "I have been crucified with Christ," he *may* mean no more than that he has passed through an experience similar to that of Christ. But when he proceeds, "And it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me," [1] it needs some very strange exegetical spectacles to

[1] Dr. Denney dilutes it into "my life is no longer mine; it is Christ who lives in me." (*Death of Christ*, p. 151.)

distort this into a moral union. Even if the language is exaggerated, since emotion is at white heat, the actual fact must be on the lines of the expression, though it may lag behind it. And at its lowest valuation a mystical union must be meant, in which something analogous to the substitution of Christ for his own personality had been effected. Even clearer, perhaps, is 1 Corinthians vi. 17. The words "he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit," are themselves very striking, and do not readily lend themselves to anything but a personal identification. In fact it is difficult to see how a mystical union could be better described than by this daring sentence. The context, however, definitely excludes the thought of a merely moral union. Paul is showing that impurity is inconsistent with the Christian life. So close is the physical union in the case involved, that two bodies coalesce into one, and where one of the participants in the act is a Christian, he is guilty of making the members of Christ the members of a harlot. The Apostle proceeds to point out that the coalescence of Christ and the believer into one spirit is just as intimate as is the coalescence of the two physical organisms into one body and one flesh. The parallel shows quite clearly that a union is intended far closer that anything implied in the term "moral union." There are other passages which are much more naturally interpreted of mystical than of moral union, such as "your life is hid with Christ in God" or "Christ who is our life." When once the mystical sense has been demonstrated, it then holds the field for all the cognate passages, and they are very numerous.

It is necessary to keep distinct the racial and the individual experiences, though it is not always easy to discover to which a passage may refer. The racial experiences are those of Eden and of Calvary. In Eden the race sinned, was pronounced guilty and doomed to physical death. On Calvary the race suffered and died for its sin, broke free

from its claim and its power, was justified by God, and secured the ultimate reversal in the resurrection of its sentence of physical death. But in the case of the individual we pass into the region of personal choice. Physical death and physical resurrection are, it is true, individual experiences, which happen whether we will or not. But whether we stand with Adam and remain on the level of the natural, or whether we become one with Christ, die with Him to our old life and rise into the new, that is a matter for personal decision.

It is only when the sinner believes in Christ that the racial experience of Calvary becomes his personal experience. The act of faith does one thing for us, but that one thing includes all. It vitally unites us to Christ, so that we reproduce His redemptive experiences. We share His character, His status before God and His destiny. It is not necessary to follow this out in detail. I must say, however, how emphatically I disagree with Dr. Denney's statement, expressed with characteristic vehemence in his Commentary on Romans (*Expositor's Greek Testament*, ii. 575), that justification by faith is the fundamental doctrine. If we are speaking of Theology in general, the doctrine of God is the fundamental doctrine; but if we are speaking of the soteriology of Paul on its personal side, the fundamental doctrine is union with Christ. It is because a man is "in Christ" that God pronounces him righteous. One would sometimes imagine that Paul never said anything on the subject, but that God justifies the ungodly. Why we should want to give the enemy more cause to blaspheme than they have at present I have never been able to discover, but the statement that God pronounces a man righteous when as a matter of fact he is a sinner, is not calculated to reassure those whose faith in the morality of Paulinism has been undermined. To speak quite frankly, while Paul uses the phrase, it does not accurately express his doctrine. The

use of it in a quite popular and not a scientifically accurate way is easy to understand. The man who comes to God is a sinner, and in response to his faith God justifies him. I could myself quite well speak of this in popular language and say that God had justified the ungodly. But what really happens is this. The sinner believes on Christ; this act of faith makes him one with Christ; as one with Christ he is a new creature, who has died to his old life, the man who now stands before God's bar stands there in Christ, and therefore is righteous and shares Christ's status before God, so that God can and does pronounce him righteous. The phrase which best expresses Paul's actual doctrine is "to be justified in Christ" (Gal. ii. 17), which reappears in a negative form in Romans viii. 1: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." To me the place assigned by Professor Denney to justification by faith shows very impressively how a lack of sympathy with an author (in this case with his mysticism) may throw out of focus the whole presentation of his teaching.

Even more disastrous is the result in the sphere of the Christian life. Its motive power he seems to find in gratitude. As we contemplate the mighty work Christ has done for us, our hearts are filled with thankfulness to Him, and this keeps us loyal to His will. It is no concern of mine to depreciate this motive; I recognize its value and remember the place it filled in Paul's own life. In the storms which beat us it is well to have all our anchors out. But I also have no doubt that this anchor by itself will not hold us. It may suffice for some. A man with a sensitive conscience and a deep sense of guilt, of a grateful temper and endowed with high moral character, might feel so overwhelmed with gratitude as to live a holy life for the future. But this combination is rare. The gospel has not to save a mere aristocracy of

character. It calls the sinful, the degraded, the debased, the morally callous and the emotionally unresponsive, the men of strong passions, and paralysed will. Their sense of guilt is but feeble, they appreciate only very faintly what sacrifice Christ has made for them; their gratitude is but a wisp of straw to check the mad career of their desires. Yet it is men like these that the gospel cleanses and saves and keeps. I marvel at the doctrine which teaches that Christ alone redeems, and leaves the redeemed to keep themselves. Dr. Denney may insist that this does not represent his view, but he certainly uses language that exposes him to the charge of a kind of Deism in this particular sphere.[1] I confess quite frankly that gratitude, though I trust it plays its part, is not in my own personal life a force on which I should dare to stake my moral career; and, if so, what of the millions whose circumstances have been so much less fortunate than my own? If there is one thing which experience in the Christian life forces upon us it is this, that what saves us from being sucked into the black whirlpool is not that we hold so fast to Christ that the swirling waters cannot pluck us from Him, but that He holds us with His strong grip. It is because we are one with Christ, that His resources meet all our needs. We have died His death to sin and the law, the flesh has been crucified with its passions and desires. Omit from Paul's doctrine our mystical union with Christ, and all you have is a fatally eviscerated Paulinism. And I would rather stand with Paul, confessing that all I have I owe to Christ,

[1] See *The Death of Christ*, p. 143 (with the gibe in the footnote at "theologians in love with the 'mystic union'"), pp. 178, 179. No doubt Dr. Denney may urge that he traces back the Christian life to Christ, since His death creates the gratitude that inspires it. It is curious to find so vigorous an opponent of Ritschlianism putting so onesided an emphasis on the impression made on us by the historical Christ. I do not think many Christians will accept the notion of an absentee Christ, and I should much regret to think that Dr. Denney really held a view which *some* of his language seems to involve.

not simply forgiveness and justification, but the power to lead a new life, dwelling in the secret place of the Most High because my life has been hid with Christ in God, than claim anything for my own nerveless hands and unsteady feet, even though it be but the strength that comes from a gratitude, which He has Himself inspired.

And now as confirming the results already attained, let me suggest, in a few words, how Paul reached his individualistic and his racial doctrines. His theology is in the main the creation of his own experience. His life of happy innocence, when as a child he knew nothing of sin, was rudely destroyed by the coming of the Law. At its touch, the spell which held sin in a charmed slumber in his flesh was broken; he realized the austere moral order under which he lived, and his own disharmony with it. And though his better self strove to fulfil its behests, the lower nature was too powerful. From this tragic schism of his being he had been released by Christ. In his death with Him, his old tyrant Sin had been condemned and executed, and the flesh which was Sin's fortress had been crucified, while he had escaped into the freedom of the Spirit, where no external law was able to follow him. These experiences supplied him with much of his doctrine of Sin and Salvation, and his doctrine of the two Adams largely originated in the same way. He was not content till he had tracked the principles he had discovered to their source. His own experience was the key to the philosophy of history and the clue to the riddle of the universe. His own heart was the mimic theatre in which he saw enacted the long and colossal conflict of good and evil. Seeking the one in the many he generalized his personal into a great racial experience, finding in the latter an interpretation of the former.

ARTHUR S. PEAKE.

CHARACTERISTICS OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

I.

As recently as 1895, in the opening chapter of a beginner's manual of New Testament Greek, the present writer defined Hellenistic Greek as "*Hebraic* Greek, *colloquial* Greek, and *late* Greek." In a second edition, just published, the first of these three elements has to disappear, and when "*common*" has been substituted for "*Hebraic*," it is soon made clear that the addition of "*late*" makes little difference to the definition. The disappearance of that word "Hebraic" from our definitions marks a revolution in the conception of the language in which the New Testament is written. It is not a revolution affecting theories only. It touches exegesis at innumerable points. It demands large modifications in our very latest grammars, and an overhauling of our best and most trusted commentaries. To set forth the nature of these new lights, with reference to the grammar of the sacred books, will be the aim of the present series of papers.

It was of course the isolated position of Biblical Greek which was responsible for the older view. That the Greek Scriptures were written in the κοινή, the "common" Greek which superseded the dialects of the classical period, was well enough known. But it was most obviously different from the κοινή of the later literature. It could not be adequately paralleled from Plutarch or Arrian, as little from the Jewish writers Philo and Josephus. Naturally the peculiarities of Biblical Greek came to be explained from its own conditions. The LXX. was "translation Greek," its syntax determined perpetually by that of its original

Hebrew. The New Testament writers were so familiar with the LXX. that its idiosyncrasies passed largely into their own style. Moreover, they used Greek as foreigners, in most cases thinking in Aramaic what they expressed in Greek. Hence this "language of the Holy Ghost," this "Judaic" or "Biblical" Greek, a phenomenon perfectly explicable by the laws of the science of language, and evidenced by scores of usages which had Hebraism written over their very face and denied every effort of the Purist to dislodge them.

And now all this has vanished, for Biblical Greek is isolated no more. Great collections of Egyptian papyri, published with amazing rapidity by the busy explorers who have restored to us so many lost literary treasures during the last decade, have shown us that the farmer of the Fayûm spoke a Greek essentially identical with that of the Evangelists. The most convincing "Hebraisms" appear in the private letters of men who could never have been in contact with Semitic influences. And lest we should imagine this vernacular peculiar to Egypt, the ever-growing corpus of inscriptions from Asia Minor tells us that there was practically no difference in colloquial Greek wherever it was spoken, except, no doubt, in pronunciation, and in minute points of usage which lie mostly beyond our reach. The Holy Ghost spoke absolutely in the language of the people, as we might surely have expected He would. The writings inspired of Him were those

> Which he may read that binds the sheaf,
> Or builds the house, or digs the grave;

nor less—as the centenary of the Bible Society so vividly reminds us just now—

> those wild eyes that watch the wave,
> In roarings round the coral reef.

The very grammar and dictionary cry aloud against those

who would allow the Scriptures to appear in any other style of speech than that understanded of the people.

The evidence for this new view starts from the lexical researches of G. A. Deissmann in his now famous "Bible Studies (1895, 1897; E.T. 1901)." It is needless to describe how he showed from the monuments of spoken Greek that scores of words, hitherto assumed to be "Biblical"—technical words, as it were, called into existence or minted afresh by the language of Jewish religion—were, in reality, normal first-century Greek, excluded from literature by the nice canons of Atticizing taste. Some gleanings after Deissmann, all tending to confirm his doctrine, have recently appeared in the EXPOSITOR;[1] and the present writer has also endeavoured to set forth, in the *Classical Review*,[2] the grammatical side of the case, only briefly adumbrated by the pioneer. Every fresh volume of papyri has exploded some old-established "Hebraism" or secularized some relic of a "Biblical" vocabulary. Let us endeavour, before going further, to see how Hebraisms stand now, and on what principles we are to interpret what remains of this element in the language.

For this purpose we must endeavour to realize the conditions of countries where the mass of the people are bilingual. It would be difficult to find a better object lesson than that which we have at our own doors in the people of Wales. If some leading statesman were to visit a place in the heart of Wales to address a meeting, the people would gather to hear him, though they would take for granted he would speak in English. If he did, they would understand him. But if he unexpectedly addressed them in Welsh, we may be very sure they would be "the more quiet"; and a speaker who was anxious to conciliate a hostile meeting would gain a great initial advantage if he could surprise them with the

[1] See the issues for April 1901, February and December 1903.
[2] The first two papers appeared in February and December 1901.

sound of their native tongue. Now this is exactly what happened when Paul addressed the Jerusalem mob from the stairs of Antonia. They took for granted he would speak in Greek, and yet they made "a great silence" when he faced them with the gesture which indicated a wish to address them. Schürer nods, for once, when he calls Paul's Aramaic speech as a witness of the people's ignorance of Greek.[1] It does not prove even the "inadequate" knowledge which he gives as the alternative possibility for the lower classes, if by "inadequate knowledge" is implied that the crowd would have been unable to follow a Greek speech. They thought and spoke among themselves, like the Welsh, exclusively in their native tongue, but we may well doubt if there were many of them who could not understand the world-language or even speak in it when necessary.[2] We may compare the situation at Lystra (Acts xiv. 11–18), where the people obviously understood Paul and Barnabas, but would probably have grasped their message much better if they had been able to speak *Λυκαονιστί*. The imperfect knowledge of Greek which may be assumed for the masses in Jerusalem and Lystra is decidedly less probable for Galilee and Peræa. Hellenist Jews, ignorant of Aramaic, would be found there as in Jerusalem; and the proportion of foreigners would be much larger. That Jesus Himself and the Apostles regularly used Aramaic is beyond question, but that Greek was also at command is almost equally certain. There is not the slightest presumption against the use of Greek in writings purporting to emanate from the circle of the first believers. They would write as men who had used the language from boyhood, not as foreigners painfully expressing themselves in an imperfectly known idiom. Their Greek would differ in quality according to

[1] *Jewish People*, div. II. i. 48 (=vol. ii. p. 63 of the third German edition).

[2] The evidence for the use of Greek in Palestine is very fully stated by Zahn in the second chapter of his *Einleitung i. d. N.T.*

their education, like that of the private letters among the Egyptian papyri. But even the Greek of the Apocalypse itself does not seem to owe any of its blunders to "Hebraism." The author's obvious indifference to concord can be abundantly paralleled from Egypt.[1] We do not suspect foreign upbringing in an Englishman who says "between you and I." He would not say "between I and you," any more than the author of the Apocalypse would have said ἀπὸ ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός (i. 5); it is only that his grammatical sense is satisfied when the governing word has affected the case of one object.[2] Close to the other end of the scale stands the learned Rabbi of Tarsus. "A Hebrew, the son of Hebrews," he calls himself, and Zahn is no doubt right in inferring that he always claimed Aramaic as his mother tongue. But he manifestly used Greek from childhood with entire freedom, and during the main part of his life probably had very few opportunities of using Aramaic at all. It is extremely risky to argue with Zahn from "*Abba*, Father" (Rom. viii. 15, Gal. iv. 6), that Aramaic was the language of Paul's prayers: the peculiar sacredness of association belonging to the first word of the Lord's Prayer in its original language supplies a far more probable account of its liturgical use among Gentile Christians.[3] Finally we have the Gentile Luke, who may well have known no Aramaic at all.[4] Apart from what may be directly translated from Semitic sources, we have accordingly no *a priori* reason to expect in the New Testament any Greek which would sound strangely to speakers of the κοινή in Gentile lands.

[1] For examples cf. Tb. P. 41 (ii/), B.U. 1002 (i/) *bis*, 910 (1/), A.P. 78 (2/), Letr. 149 (2/), etc. All these (abbreviations as in previous papers) are examples of a nominative in apposition to a noun in another case. I have several cases of false concord in gender. Ἀπὸ ὁ ὤν is, of course, an intentional *tour de force*.

[2] We find this sometimes in correct English: e.g. "Drive far away the disastrous Keres, *they* who destroy" (Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, p. 168).

[3] Cf. Chase, in *Texts and Studies*, I. iii. 23.

[4] Cf. Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, 40 f.

To what extent then should we expect to find Jewish writers of Greek colouring their style from influences of Aramaic or Hebrew? Here our Welsh analogy helps us. Captain Fluellen is marked in Shakespeare not only by his Welsh pronunciation of English, but also by his fondness for the phrase "look you." Now "look you" is English: I am told it is common in the Dales, and if we could dissociate it from Shakespeare's Welshman we should probably not be struck by it as a bizarre expression. But why does Fluellen use it so often? Because it translates two or three Welsh phrases of nearly identical meaning, which would be very much on his tongue when talking with his own countrymen. In exactly the same way the good Attic interjection *ἰδού* is used by the New Testament writers, with a frequency quite un-Attic, simply because they were accustomed to the constant use of an equivalent interjection in their own tongue.[1] Probably this is the furthest extent to which Semitisms went in the ordinary Greek speech or writing of men whose native language was Semitic. It brought into prominence locutions, correct enough as Greek, but which would have remained in comparatively rare use but for the accident of their answering to Hebrew or Aramaic phrases. And rarely a word with some special metaphorical meaning might be translated into the literally corresponding Greek and used with the same connotation, as when the verb הלך, in the ethical sense, was represented not by the exactly answering *ἀναστρέφεσθαι*, but by *περιπατεῖν*.[2] But these cases are very few, and may be transferred any day to the other category, illustrated above in the case of *ἰδού*, by the discovery of new papyrus texts.

[1] Note that James uses it six times in his short Epistle, Paul eight times (and one quotation) in all his writings. In Acts i.–xii. it appears 16 times; in xiii.–xxviii., only seven, one of which is in narrative, the rest in words of Paul.

[2] Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 194.

It must not be forgotten that the instrumental ἐν in ἐν μαχαίρῃ (Luke xxii. 49) and ἐν ῥάβδῳ (1 Cor. iv. 21) were only rescued from the class of "Hebraisms" by the publication of the *Tebtunis Papyri* (1902), which presented us with half-a-dozen Ptolemaic citations for it.[1]

There remain Semitisms due to translation, from the Hebrew of the Old Testament, or from Aramaic "sources," underlying parts of the Synoptists and *Acts*. The former case covers all the usages which have been supposed to arise from the over-literal phraseology of the LXX., the constant reading of which by Hellenist Jews has unconsciously affected their Greek. Here of course we have abnormal Greek produced by the effect of Greek-speaking men to translate the already obsolete and imperfectly understood Hebrew. When the Hebrew puzzled them they would take refuge in a barbarous literalness, like a schoolboy translating Virgil. It was ignorance of אֵת, not ignorance of σύν, which was responsible for Aquila's ἐν κεφαλαίῳ ἔκτισεν ὁ θεὸς σὺν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σὺν τὴν γῆν. It is not antecedently probable that such "translation-Greek" would influence free Greek except by supplying phrases for conscious or unconscious quotation: these phrases would not become models to be followed by men who wrote the language as their own. The "pure Hebraisms" which Dalman[2] finds in Luke's writings are possibly exceptions; but we may perhaps assume that Luke would intentionally assimilate his style to that of the Greek Old Testament in those parts of his story where a Hebraic colour was specially appropriate. The construction of ἐγένετο impersonal[3] is markedly transformed in a classical direction in *Acts*, partly (we may suppose) because the author wearied of what might seem a mannerism, and partly because the Hebraic colour

[1] Expositor, Feb. 1902, p. 112.
[2] *Words of Jesus*, p. 37.
[3] See detailed note at the end of this paper.

was less appropriate in a book which moved so largely on a wider stage. That the Greek Evangelist should exhibit the capacity of varying his diction to suit the change of scene is only what we should expect: no other New Testament writer, except the author of *Hebrews*, betrays any conscious attention to Greek ideas of style.

Such then is the issue of the long strife over the "Hebraisms" of New Testament Greek, so far as our present lights enable us to apprehend it. We must not forget the danger of going too far. The deeper knowledge of Palestinian Aramaic, which Dalman's researches have brought us, may disclose traces of imperfectly translated phrases from Aramaic documents; nor could the bald literalism of parts of the LXX. remain wholly without influence on the style of Evangelists and Apostles. We must allow for possible Semitisms from these very different sources, and must be more careful to distinguish them than scholars before Dalman were wont to be. But the papyri have finally disposed of the assumption that the New Testament was written in any other Greek than the language of the common people throughout the Greek-speaking lands. With this fact as a basis, we shall endeavour in the successive papers of this series to describe the main features of the common Greek of daily life, in so far as its grammatical structure bears upon the unique literature which survives to glorify the "degenerate" speech of provincial Hellenists in the first century A.D.

Note on the Hebraisms with ἐγένετο.

The impersonal ἐγένετο, answering to the narrative וַיְהִי, is in the New Testament very rare outside Luke's writings, in which the supposition of a Hebrew original is seen to be impossible (Dalman, p. 33). There are three constructions:—(*a*) ἐγένετο ἤλθε, (*b*) ἐγένετο καὶ ἦλθε, (*c*) ἐγένετο (αὐτὸν) ἐλθεῖν. In the Gospel we find in W.H. *text* 22 cases of (*a*), 11 of (*b*), and 5 of (*c*); in the *Acts* there are 17 of (*c*), but none of (*a*) or (*b*). (Blass gives one of (*a*) from the β text, and finds (*b*) in v. 7; but since the latter construction is isolated in *Acts*, it seems much better to make

διάστημα subject of the verb.) It may be added that the construction occurs predominantly in connexion with ἐν, and especially ἐν τῷ c. inf., which is another of Dalman's Hebraisms. In the (*a*) passages 10 out of 22 have ἐν τῷ, and 4 have ἐν with a noun: in the (*b*) 8 have ἐν τῷ, 3 ἐν, and there is no other occurrence (W.H. *margin* in ix. 28 being the only exception); while in the (*c*), in the Gospel, only xvi. 22 is without ἐν. Mark has the (*a*) construction twice, both times with ἐν, and Matthew five times, in the phrase ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν κ.τ.λ. We have one case of (*b*) in Matthew (ix. 10—a time clause and καὶ ἰδού), and one of (*c*) in Mark (ii. 23—also ii. 15 with γίνεται). It seems to follow that the phrase originated in temporal sentences like our phrase, so much beloved of novelists, "It was in the days of . . . that . . ." This is the (*c*) form, but we could use the paratactic (*a*), or even (*b*), without transgressing our idiom. Greek idiom is affected by the substitution of ἐγένετο for συνέβη which in the (*c*) construction would be normal. But I do not feel sure that (*a*) was foreign to the vernacular. It is found in the modern speech: cf. Palli's version Matt. xi. 1, καὶ συνέβηκε, σὰν τέλιωσε . . . , ἔφυγε . . ., etc. (In Athenian vernacular συνέβη ὅτι ἤρθε is idiomatic: in the country districts, I am told, ἔτυχε νὰ ἔλθῃ is more common.) At the same time it must be allowed that the correspondence with Hebrew is exceedingly close in (*a*) and (*b*). Driver (*Tenses* § 78) describes the וַיְהִי construction as occurring when there is inserted "a clause specifying the circumstances under which an action takes place,"—a description which will suit the Lucan usage everywhere, except sometimes in the (*c*) class (as xvi. 22), the only one of the three which has no Hebrew parallel. We must infer that the LXX. translators used this locution as a just tolerable Greek which literally represented the original; and that Luke (and to a minute extent Matthew and Mark) deliberately recalled the Greek Old Testament by using the phrase. The (*c*) construction appears to be a fusion of this with the normal Greek συνέβη *c. acc. et inf.* Its rarity in Luke's Gospel and marked development in *Acts* even suggests that it was his own coinage. The solitary LXX. parallel (W.M. 760 n), 2 Macc. iii. 16, has ἦν, which may be an independent attempt to bring the Greek nearer to the familiar Hebrew. In Mark ii. 23 we might explain its isolated occurrence as a primitive assimilation to Luke vi. 1; note that so early a witness as the combination B C D does assimilate the infinitive here (διαπορεύεσθαι for Mark's παραπορ.). There only remains Mark ii. 15 γίνεται κατακεῖσθαι αὐτόν . . Here the parallel Matt. ix. 10 has the (*b*) form, no doubt diverging from (*a*) only to bring in the writer's favourite καὶ ἰδού. Is it possible that Mark originally had simply καὶ κατάκειται αὐτός? If so, γίνεται will be due to a blending of Matthew's ἐγένετο with the present tense of Mark: the later MSS. made the assimilation more complete by changing the tense.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

(To be continued.)

THE LIFE OF CHRIST ACCORDING TO ST. MARK.[1]

XVII. Attempts to Silence Jesus, III. 20–35.

Up to this point St. Mark's brief notes give the impression of uninterrupted success; hindrances had indeed arisen, but they had been quietly and effectively overcome; and they had been chiefly due to His reputation as a healer and His extraordinary popularity. But these had neither bewildered nor intoxicated Him, and He had persevered in His true work as a spiritual leader and teacher. Almost from the outset, however, He had been influenced by the opposition of the Pharisees. Left to Himself He would rather have preached a positive righteousness than have denounced the Pharisaic traditions; but the hostility of the scribes led him to emphasize the incompatibility of the doctrine of salvation by ceremonies with the truths of the Kingdom. As St. Mark continues his story, it is clear that the work of Jesus was more and more shaped by the forces that resisted Him, so that He comes to be not so much a leader as a champion of righteousness involved in a mortal struggle with evil.

Some time since we left the Pharisees discussing with the Herodians how Jesus' violation of the sanctity of the Sabbath might be used to ruin Him. They had expected the people to be as shocked as they were themselves, but His commanding influence remained unshaken, so that He could only have been arrested by a military force; and the

[1] These studies do not profess to be an adequate historical and doctrinal account of Christ, but are an attempt to set forth the impression which St. Mark's account of our Lord would make on a reader whose only source of information was the Second Gospel, and who knew nothing of Christian dogmatics.

Herodian officials were not likely to take much trouble or run any risks for the sake of the Pharisees or the Sabbath. Some other means had to be found of dealing with Jesus. The following paragraphs describe the efforts of the Pharisees.

They seem to have had recourse in the first instance to the family of Jesus. The family in the ancient East as in modern France exercised considerable authority over its members; and the family meant more than mother and father and children. There would be uncles and cousins from whom the widowed Mary and her sons would be expected to seek counsel, and to whom they owed a certain deference. To these heads of the family would come the Pharisees with stories of the way in which Jesus was disgracing Himself and His family by flagrant defiance of the Law. His friends would find it hard to believe such tales; they would reply that till He left home His life had been exemplary and devout. When they were convinced by overwhelming evidence, they would agree with the scribes that there could be only one explanation of such behaviour on the part of so good a man—Jesus had gone mad. Primitive people regard madness as a sign of inspiration; a somewhat more advanced society converts the proposition, and sees in inspiration a symptom of mental aberration. Finally His friends thought they had a decisive proof of insanity when they heard that He was so occupied with the crowds of patients and disciples that He neglected to take food. So the friends of Jesus set out to take charge of Him, and protect Him from the consequences of His madness. It is not clear whether St. Mark leaves us to assume that they failed, and that Mary and her sons afterwards made a second separate attempt to lay hold of Jesus; or whether the action of Mary was the only effort of the family to effect their purpose. To those who have no pre-

judices in favour of the Law, it is difficult to understand how any one could ever have thought Jesus mad; in the narrative He appears throughout as sane, sober, and serene.

Meanwhile the scribes were busy on their own account; they pervaded the crowds, and whispered a suggestion of insanity in an uglier form. The local clergy, to use a modern term, had called to their aid some ecclesiastics from the capital, scribes from Jerusalem. These experts were told that Jesus claimed to be inspired by the Spirit of God.

"Doubtless," said they, "He is possessed by a spirit, but it is an unclean spirit, a devil. He has made a compact with Beelzebub, the Prince of the Devils, to overthrow the Law, and that he may do so, Beelzebub allows him to cast out devils, so that he may seem to be a benevolent prophet of God, and be able to pervert the minds of men."

These charges were repeated to Jesus, and He called His accusers to Him.

"How," said He, "can Satan cast out Satan? If a kingdom be divided against itself, that kingdom cannot stand; and if a household be divided against itself, that household cannot stand; and if Satan makes war upon himself, he cannot stand. No one can go into a strong man's house and spoil his goods without first binding the strong man."

The devil would surely have found some better way of aiding a heretic propaganda than by bringing shame and confusion and defeat on his subordinate demons.

When Jesus turned His thoughts to the moral aspect of their conduct He was moved to indignation, as when the scribes rejected His appeal for a humane interpretation of the rules for the Sabbath. Now their slander was not only

foolish but wicked. In their zeal for what they considered orthodoxy they had committed the unpardonable sin; because Jesus differed from them on details of external observance they had declared that the divine was devilish, and that the Holy Spirit which had descended upon Him from heaven was Beelzebub, the foulest of demons from the lowest hell. All other sins and blasphemies might be forgiven but this sin could not be pardoned; it was an eternal sin, and indeed it has never yet been stamped out; it cannot be forgiven, because the sinners who are guilty of it think that they are just men who need no repentance.

When Jesus had confounded these scribes, He had to meet another and even more distressing attempt to silence Him. These episodes suggest in a curious remote fashion the successive deputations to Coriolanus, perhaps because here also the last effort to move Jesus from His purpose was made by His mother. She was probably instigated and directed by the Pharisees, for we seem to see here also the same malignant ingenuity that charged Him with being possessed by a devil. Surely His mother, left to herself, would have tried to see her son in private; as it was, the incident was planned to be much more dramatic. He was sitting teaching surrounded by a crowded audience, and His mother and brothers sent Him a message to come to them. To her He was still the lad who was to be amenable to her authority, and her attitude was that of an offended parent to an erring son. The message was brought to Him. Obedience would only have led to a painful scene, and with His usual prompt decisiveness, He quietly put the interruption on one side, and went on with His teaching. The aphorism with which He replied to the message was a justification as well as a refusal, not a mere expedient for the special occasion, but the statement of a

permanent principle; He looked round on the circle of disciples and said:

"Behold my mother and my brother: whosoever does the will of God is my brother and sister and mother."

W. H. Bennett.

THE LETTERS TO THE ASIAN CHURCHES.

IV. Authority of the Writer of the Seven Letters.

In what relation did the writer of the Seven Letters stand to the Asian Churches which he addressed? This is an important question. The whole spirit of the early development of law and procedure and administration in the early Church is involved in the answer. That the writer shows so intimate a knowledge of those Churches that he must have lived long among them, will be proved by a detailed examination of the Seven Letters, and may for the present be assumed. But the question is whether he addressed the Churches simply as one who lived among them and knew their needs and want, who was qualified by wisdom and age and experience, and who therefore voluntarily offered advice and warning, which had its justification in its excellence and truth; or whether he wrote as one standing in something like an official and authoritative relation to them, charged with the duty of guiding, correcting and advising those Asian Churches, feeling himself directly responsible for their good conduct and welfare.

The question also arises whether he was merely a prophet according to the old conception of the prophetic mission, coming, as it were, forth from the desert or the field to deliver the message which was dictated to him by God, and on which his own personality and character and knowledge exercised no formative influence; or whether the message is full of his own nature, but his nature

raised to its highest possible level through that sympathy and communion with the Divine will, which constitutes, in the truest and fullest sense, "inspiration." The first of these alternatives we state only to dismiss it as bearing its inadequacy plainly written on its face. The second alone can satisfy us; and we study the Seven Letters on the theory that they are as truly and completely indicative of the writer's character and of his personal relation to his correspondents as any letters of the humblest person can be.

Probably the most striking feature of the Seven Letters is the tone of unhesitating and unlimited authority which inspires them from beginning to end. The best way to realize this tone and all that it means is to compare them with other early Christian letters: this will show by contrast how authoritative is the tone of the Seven Letters.

The letter of Clement to the Church of Corinth is not expressed as his own (though undoubtedly, and by general acknowledgment, it is his letter, expressing his sentiments regarding the Corinthians), but as the letter of the Roman Church. All assumption or appearance of personal authority is carefully avoided. The warning and advice are addressed by the Romans as authors, not to the Corinthians only, but equally to the Romans themselves. "These things we write, not merely as admonishing you, but also as reminding ourselves," § 7. The first person plural is very often used in giving advice: "let us set before ourselves the noble examples," § 5; and so on in many other cases. Rebuke, on the other hand, is often expressed in general terms: "that which is written was fulfilled; my beloved ate and drank, and was enlarged and waxed fat and kicked": such is the conclusion of a long panegyric on the Corinthians, § 2. The panegyric is expressed in the second person plural, but the blame at the end is in this general impersonal form.

A good example of this way is found in § 44. Here the Corinthians are blamed for having deposed certain bishops or presbyters; but the second personal form is never used. "Those who were duly appointed . . . these men we consider to be unjustly thrust out from their ministration. For it will be no light sin for us if we thrust out those who have offered the gifts of the bishop's office unblamably and holily."[1] It would be impossible to express criticism of the conduct of others in more courteous and modest form, and yet it is all the more effective on that account: "if we do this, we shall incur grievous sin."

Most strongly and directly expressed is § 47. It is entirely in the second person plural; but here the Romans shelter themselves behind the authority of Paul, who "charged you in the Spirit . . . because even then ye had made parties"; and on this authority the direct address continues to the end of the chapter; but the next sentence resumes the modest form, "let us therefore root this out quickly."

An example equally good, and even more instructive, because addressed to several of the same Churches not many years later, is found in the letters of Ignatius. Here we have letters written by the bishop of Antioch, the mother Church of all the Asian Churches, and by him when raised through the near approach of death to a plane higher than mere humanity. He was already marked out for death—to Christians the most honourable death—as the representative of his Church, and was on his way to the place of execution. He was eager to gain the crown of life; he had done with all thought of earth. If there was any one who could speak authoritatively to the Asian Churches, it was their Syrian mother through her chosen representative.

[1] Lightfoot's translation (which I use often, where it is advisable to bring out clearly that I am not pressing the words to suit my own inferences).

But there is not, in any of his letters, anything approaching, even in the remotest degree, to the authoritative tone of John's letters to the Seven Churches, or of Paul's letters, or of Peter's letter to the Asian Churches.

The Ephesians especially are addressed by Ignatius with profound respect. He ought to "be trained by them for the contest in faith," § 3. He hopes to "be found in the company of the Christians of Ephesus," § 11. He is "devoted to them and their representatives," § 21. He apologises for seeming to offer advice to them, who should be his teachers; but they may be schoolfellows together—a touch which recalls the tone of Clement's letter; he does not give orders to them, as though he were of some consequence," § 3. The tone throughout is that of one who feels deeply that he is honoured in associating with the Ephesian Church through its envoys.

There is not the same tone of profound respect in Ignatius's letters to Magnesia, Tralleis, Philadelphia, and Smyrna, as in his letter to Ephesus. It is apparent that the Syrian bishop regarded Ephesus as occupying a position of loftier dignity than the other Churches of the Province; and this is an important fact in itself. It proves that already there was the beginning of a feeling, in some minds at least, that the Church of the presiding city of a Province[1] was of higher dignity than those of the other cities, a feeling which ultimately grew into the recognition of metropolitan bishoprics and exarchates, and a fully formed and graded hierarchy.

But even to those Churches of less splendid history, his tone is not that of authority. It is true that he sometimes

[1] Usually, though not necessarily, the political capital. Probably Ephesus, though the greatest city in most respects of Asia, the gate and harbour looking out to the West and to Rome, was not politically the capital before Hadrian's time. The old capital of the Asian kings, Pergamus, continued to be the Roman capital of the Province until the end of the first or early second century.

uses the imperative; but in the more simple language of the Eastern peoples, as in modern Greek and Turkish (at least in the conversational style), the imperative mood is often used, without any idea of command, by an inferior to a superior, or by equal to equal; and in such cases it expresses no more than extreme urgency. In Magn. § 3 the tone is one of urgent reasoning, and Lightfoot in his commentary rightly paraphrases it "I exhort you." In § 6 the form is "I advise you," as Lightfoot's translation gives it. In § 10 the advice is expressed in the first person plural (as we found to be characteristic of Clement), "let us learn to live," "let us not be insensible to His goodness." Then follows in § 11 an apology for even advising his correspondents, "not because I have learned that any of you are so minded, but as one inferior to you, I would have you be on your guard betimes." When in Trall. § 3 he is tempted to use the language of reproof, he refrains: "I did not think myself competent for this, that being a convict I should give orders to you as though I were an Apostle."[1]

It is needless to multiply examples. The tone of the letters is the same throughout. Ignatius has not the right, like Paul or Peter or an Apostle, to issue commands to the Asian Churches. He can only advise, and exhort, and reason—in the most urgent terms, but as equal to equals, as man to men, or, as he modestly puts it, as inferior to superiors. He has just the same right and duty that every Christian has of interesting himself in the life of all other Christians, of advising and admonishing and entreating them to take the course which he knows to be proper.

But John writes in an utterly different spirit, with the tone of absolute authority. He carries this tone to an extreme far beyond that even of the other Apostles, Paul

[1] The text of Trall. § 3 is not entirely certain. Compare also Rom. § 9, quoted in next section.

and Peter, in writing to the Asian Churches. Paul writes as their father and teacher: authority is stamped on every sentence of his letters. Peter reviews their circumstances, points out the proper line of conduct in various situations and relations, addresses them in classes—the officials and the general congregation — in a tone of authority and responsibility throughout. He writes because he feels bound to prepare them in view of coming trials.

But John writes the Divine voice with absolute authority of spiritual life and death in the present and the future. Such a tone cannot be, and probably hardly ever has been, certainly is not now by any scholar, regarded as the result of mere assumption and pretence. Who can imagine as a possibility of human nature that one who can think the thoughts expressed in these letters could pretend to such authority either as a fanciful dreamer deluding himself or as an actual impostor? Such suggestions would be unreal and inconceivable.

It is a psychological impossibility that these Letters to the Asian Churches could have been written by any one, unless he felt himself, and had the right to feel himself, charged with the superintendence and oversight of all those Churches, invested with Divinely given and absolute authority over them, gifted by long knowledge and sympathy with insight unto their nature and circumstances, able to understand the line on which each was developing, and finally bringing to a focus in one moment of supreme inspiration—whose manner none but himself could understand or imagine—all the powers he possessed of knowledge, of intellect, of intensest love, of gravest responsibility, of sympathy with the Divine life, of commission from his Divine Teacher.

Moreover, when we consider how sternly St. Paul denounced and resented any interference from any quarter, however influential, with the conduct of his Churches, and

how carefully he explained and apologised for his own intention of visiting Rome, that he might not seem to "build on another's foundation," and again when we take into consideration the constructive capacity of the early Church and all that is implied in that, we must conclude that John's authority was necessarily connected with his publicly recognized position as the head of those Asian Churches, and did not arise merely from his general commission as an Apostle.

In a word we must recognize the authoritative succession in the Asian Churches of those three writers: first and earliest him who speaks in the Pauline letters: secondly, him who wrote "to the Elect who are sojourners of the Dispersion in . . . Asia" and the other Provinces: lastly, the author of the Seven Letters.

V. Pagan Converts in the Early Church.

In one respect Ignatius is peculiarly instructive for the study of the early Asian Churches, in which the converts direct from Paganism must have been a numerous and important body. This peculiar position and spirit of Pagan converts (coming direct from Paganism), as distinguished from Jews or those Pagans who had come into the Church through the door of the Jewish synagogue, must engage our attention frequently during the study of the Seven Letters; and Ignatius will prove the best introduction, and a frequent court of appeal as a commentator.

The Pagan converts had not the preliminary education in Jewish thoughts and religious ideas which a previous acquaintance with the service of the synagogue had given those Gentiles who had been among "the God-fearing" before they came over to Christianity. The direct passage from Paganism to Christianity must have left a different mark on their nature. Doubtless, some or even many of them came from a state of religious indifference or of vicious and degraded life. But others, and probably the majority

of them, must have previously had religious sensibility and religious aspirations. Now what became of those early religious ideas during their later career as Christians? If they had previously entertained any religious aspirations and thoughts, these must have sought expression, and occasionally met with stimulus and found partial satisfaction in some forms of Pagan worship or speculation. Did these men, when they as Christians looked back on their Pagan life, regard those moments of religious experience as being merely evil and devilish; or did they see that such actions had been the groping and effort of nature towards God, giving increased strength and vitality to their longing after God, and that those moments had been really steps in their progress, incomplete but not entirely wrong?

To this inevitable question Ignatius helps us to find an answer, applicable to some cases, though not, of course, to all. That he had been a convert from Paganism is inferred with evident justification by Lightfoot from his letter to the Romans, § 9. He was born into the Church out of due time, imperfect in nature, by an irregular and violent birth, converted late, after a career which was to him a lasting cause of shame and humiliation in his new life. That feeling might be considered as partly a cause of the profound humility which we observed in him towards the long-established Ephesian Church. Hence he writes to the Romans: "I do not give orders to you as Peter and Paul did: they were Apostles, I am a convict; they were free, but I am a slave to this very hour." In the last expression we may see a reference, not to his having been literally a slave (as many do), but to his having been formerly enslaved to the passions and desires of Paganism; and from this slavery he can hope to be set free completely only through death: death will give to him liberty, and already even in the journey and the preparation to meet death, "I am learning to put away every desire."

The remarkable passage in Eph. § 9 must arrest every reader's attention: "Ye are all companions in the way, God-bearers, shrine-bearers, Christ-bearers, and bearers of your holy things, arrayed from head to foot in the commandments of Jesus Christ; and I, too, taking part in the festival, am permitted by letter to bear you company." The life of the Ephesian Christians is pictured after the analogy of a religious procession on the occasion of a festival; life for them is one long religious festival and procession. Now at this time it is impossible to suppose that public processions could have formed part of their worship. Imperial law and custom, popular feeling, and the settled rule of conduct in the Church, all alike forbade such public and provocative display of Christian worship; and moreover we cannot believe that the Church had as yet come to the stage when such ceremonial was admitted as part of the established ritual.

Yet the passage sets before the readers in the most vivid way the picture of such a festal scene, with a troop of rejoicing devotees clad in the appropriate garments, bearing their religious symbols and holy things in procession through the streets. That is exactly the scene which was presented to the eyes of all Ephesians several times every year at the great festivals of the goddess; and Ignatius had often seen such processions in his own city of Antioch. He cannot but have known what image his words would call up in the minds of his readers, and he cannot but have intended to call up that image, point by point, and detail after detail. The heathen devotees were dressed for the occasion, mostly in white garments,[1] with garlands of the sacred foliage (whatever tree or plant the deity preferred), while many of the principal personages wore special dress of a still more sacred character, which marked them as

[1] At least that was the colour in Rome, where *candida urbs* was the city on a holy day.

playing for the time the part of the god and of his attendant divine beings, and some were adorned with the golden crown either of their deity or of the Imperial religion. But the Ephesian Christians wear the orders of Christ.

The heathen devotees carried images of their gods, both the principal deities and many associated beings. The Christian Ephesians in their life carry God and carry Christ always with them, for, as Ignatius has said in the previous sentence, their conduct in the ordinary affairs of life spiritualized those affairs, inasmuch as they did everything in Christ. Many of the heathen devotees carried in their processions small shrines containing representations of their gods; but the body of every true right-living Christian is the temple and shrine of his God. The heathen carried in the procession many sacred objects, sometimes openly displayed, sometimes concealed in boxes (like the sacred mystic things, *τὰ ἀπόῤῥητα*, which were brought from Eleusis to Athens by one procession in order that a few days later they might be carried back by the great mystic procession to Eleusis for the celebration of the Mysteries); and at Ephesus we have in an inscription of this period a long enumeration of various objects and ornaments which were to be carried in one of the great annual processions. But the Christians carry holiness itself with them, wherever they go and whatever they do.

How utterly different is the spirit of this passage from the Jewish attitude towards the heathen world! Every analogy that Ignatius here draws would have been an abomination, the forbidden and hateful thing, to the Jews. It would have been loathsome to them to compare the things of God with the things of idols or devils. Ignatius evidently had never passed through the phase of Judaism; he had passed straight from Paganism to Christianity. He very rarely quotes from the Old Testament, and when he does his quotations are almost exclusively from Psalms and

Isaiah, the books which would be most frequently used by Christians.

Hence he places his new religion directly in relation with Paganism. Christianity spiritualizes and enlarges and ennobles the ceremonial of the heathen; but that ceremonial was not simply rejected by him as abominable and vile, for it was a step in the way of religion.

The point of view is noble and true, and yet it proved to be the first step in the path that led on by insensible degrees, during the loss of education in the Church, to the paganizing of religion and the transformation of the Pagan deities into saints of the Church, Demeter into St. Demetrius, Achilles Pontarches into St. Phocas of Sinope, Poseidon into St. Nicolas of Myra, and so on. From these words of Ignatius it is easy to draw the moral, which assuredly Ignatius did not dream of, that the Church should express religious feeling in similar processions; and, as thought and feeling deteriorated, the step was taken.

The same true and idealized spirit is perceptible throughout Ignatius's letters. In Eph. § 10 he says: Pray continually for the rest of mankind (i.e. those who are not Christians, and specially the Pagans), for there is in them a hope of repentance. Give them the opportunity of learning from your actions, if they will not hear you. The influence of St. Paul's teaching is here conspicuous: by nature the Gentiles do the things of the Law, if they only give their real nature free play, and do not degrade it (Rom. ii. 16).

Ignatius felt strongly the duty he owed to his former co-religionists, as Paul felt himself "a debtor both to Greeks and to Barbarians"; and just as the term "debtor" implies that Paul had received and felt himself bound to repay,[1] such indubitably must have been the thought in

[1] Some commentators seem to assume that the term "debtor" in Rom. i. 14 has lost all its strict force, and that St. Paul is merely expressing his strong sense of duty as a Christian to try to convert the Pagan

the mind of Ignatius. Ignatius learned the lesson from St. Paul, because he was prepared to learn it. Many have read him and have not learned it.

In this view new light is thrown on a series of passages in the letters of Ignatius, some of which are obscure, and one at least has been so little understood that the true reading is by many editors rejected, though Lightfoot's sympathetic feeling for Ignatius keeps him right, as it usually does throughout ; and Zahn independently has decided in favour of the same text.

One of the most characteristic and significant features in the writings of Ignatius is the emphasis that he lays on silence, as something peculiarly sacred and Divine. He recurs to this thought repeatedly. Silence is characteristic of God, speech of mankind. The more the bishop is silent, the more he is to be feared (Eph. § 6). The acts which Christ has done in silence are worthy of the Father; and he that truly possesses the Word of Christ is able even to hear His silence, so as to be perfect, so that through what he says he may be doing, and through his silence he may be understood (Eph. § 15). And so again he is astonished at the moderation of the Philadelphian bishop, whose silence is more effective than the speech of others.

So far the passages quoted, though noteworthy, do not imply anything more than a vivid appreciation of the value of reserve, so that speech should convey the impression of an unused store of strength. But the following passages do more ; they show that a certain mystic and Divine nature and value were attributed by Ignatius to Silence ;

world. But it is a false and ruinous procedure to whittle away the meaning in that way. Terms must be taken in their proper sense. No man can be made a debtor, except by receiving what he is bound to repay. Unless St. Paul had meant what lies in the word "debtor," he would not have used the term, but expressed himself otherwise. To illustrate Rom. i. 14 compare Rom. xv. 27, where St. Paul's own Churches are said to be the debtors of the poor Christians of Jerusalem, having received much from them and being therefore bound to repay, even by money.

and in the light of those two passages, the words quoted above from Eph. § 15 are seen to have also a mystic value.

In Eph. § 19 he speaks of the three great Christian mysteries—the virginity of Mary, the birth of her son, and the death of the Lord, "three mysteries shouting aloud (in the world of men), which were wrought in the Silence of God." In Magn. § 8 he speaks of God as having manifested Himself through His Son, who is His Word that proceeded from Silence.[1]

Now, we must ask what was the origin of this mystic power that Ignatius assigns to Silence. Personally, I cannot doubt that his mind and thought were influenced by his recollection of the deep impression that certain Pagan Mysteries had formerly made on him.

It is mentioned in the *Philosophumena*, lib. V.[2] that "the great and wonderful and most perfect mystery, placed before those who were [at Eleusis] initiated into the second and higher order, was a shoot of corn harvested in silence." In this brief description a striking scene is set before us: the hushed expectation of the initiated, the contrast with the louder and more crowded and dramatic scenes of the previous Mystic acts, as in absolute silence the Divine life works itself out to an end in the growing ear of corn, which is reaped before them. There can be no doubt, amid all the obscurity which envelopes the Eleusinian ceremonial, that great part of the effect which they produced on the educated and thoughtful, the intellectual and philosophic minds,[3] lay in the skilful, dramatically presented contrast between the earlier naturalistic life, set before them in

[1] I can feel no doubt that Lightfoot and Zahn are right in accepting this text: Hilgenfeld prefers the majority of MSS. which insert οὐκ before ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθών, a reading which misses all that is most characteristic of Ignatius, and can be preferred only by one who is not able "to hearken to the Silence" of Ignatius.

[2] Miller, p. 117; Cruice, p. 171.

[3] As the ancient writers imply, a philosophic training and a reverent, religious frame of mind were required to comprehend them.

scenes of violence and repulsive horror, and the later reconciliation of the jarring elements in the peaceful Divine life, as revealed for the benefit of men by the Divine power, and shown on the mystic stage as perfected in profound silence. Think of the hierophant, a little before, shouting aloud, "a holy son Brimos the Lady Brimo has borne," as the culmination of a series of outrages and barbarities: then the dead stillness, and the Divine life symbolized in the growing and garnered ear of the Divinely revealed corn. That the highest nature is silent must have been the lesson of the Eleusinian Mysteries, just as surely as they taught[1] that the life of man is immortal. Both those lessons were to Ignatius stages in the development of his religious consciousness; and the way in which, and the surroundings amid which, he had learned them affected his conception and declaration of the principles, the Mysteries of Christianity.[2]

The scene which we have described is mentioned only as forming part of the Eleusinian Mysteries; and it may be regarded as quite probable that Ignatius had been initiated at Eleusis;[3] but it is also true that (as is pointed out in Dr. Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, v. p. 126) "the Mysteries celebrated at different religious centres competed with one another in attractiveness," and they all borrowed from

[1] There was, of course, no formal dogmatic teaching: the words uttered in the representation before the initiated were concerned only with the dramatic action: the initiated gathered the lessons for themselves through their own philosophic insight by comprehending the meaning that underlay the action.

[2] Marcellus about the middle of the fourth century was influenced probably in the same way, when he declared that God was along with a Silence (*εἶναι τὸν θεὸν καὶ τινα ἡσυχίαν ἅμα τῷ θεῷ*) and that, as early heretics had taught, in the beginning there was God and Silence, *ἦν Θεὸς καὶ σιγή*.

[3] Initiation at Eleusis was in earlier times restricted to the Athenian people but was widened in later times, so that all "Hellenes" were admitted. Apollonius of Tyana was rejected in A.D. 51, but only because he was suspected of magic, not because he was a foreigner: four years later he was admitted to initiation.

one another and "adapted to their own purposes elements which seemed to be attractive in others." Hence it may be that Ignatius had witnessed that same scene, or a similar one, in other Mysteries.

Lightfoot considers (see his note on Trall. § 2) that when Ignatius speaks of the mysteries of Christianity, he has no more in his mind than "the wide sense in which the word is used by St. Paul, *revealed truths*." But we cannot agree in this too narrow estimate. To Ignatius there lies in the term a certain element of power. To him the "mysteries" of the Faith would have been very insufficiently described by such a coldly scientific definition as "revealed truths": such abstract lifeless terms were to him, as to Paul (*Col.* ii. 8), "mere philosophy and vain deceit." The "mysteries" were living, powerful realities, things of life that could move the heart and will of men and remake their nature. He uses the term, I venture to think, in a similar yet slightly different sense from Paul, who uses it very frequently. Paul, too, attaches to it something of the same idea of power; for "the mystery of iniquity" (2 *Thess.* ii. 7) is to him a real and strong enemy. But Ignatius seems to attach to the "mysteries" even more reality and objectivity than Paul does.[1]

Surely Ignatius gained his idea of the "mysteries" in his Pagan days. He had felt the strong influence to which some of the greatest thinkers among the Greeks bear testimony; and the Christian principles completed and perfected the ideas which had begun in his Pagan days.

This idea, that the religious conceptions of Paganism served as a preparatory stage leading up to Christianity, was held by many, as well as by Ignatius. Justin Martyr gave clear expression to it, and Eusebius works it out in his *Præparatio Evangelica*. Those who were conscious that a

[1] The term occurs Mark iv. 11; Matthew xiii. 11; Luke viii. 10; four times in Revelation, and twenty-one times in the Pauline Epistles.

real development of the religious sense had begun in their own mind during their Pagan days and experiences, and had been completed in their Christian life, must inevitably have held it; and there were many Pagans of a deeply religious nature, some of whom became Christians.

That the same view should be strongly held in the Asian Churches was inevitable. That often it should be pressed to an extreme was equally inevitable; and one of its extreme forms was the Nicolaitan heresy, which the writer of the Seven Letters seems to have regarded as the most pressing and immediate danger to those Churches. That writer was a Jew, who was absolutely devoid of sympathy for that whole side of thought, alike in its moderate and its extreme forms. The moderate forms seemed to him lukewarm; the extreme forms were a simple abomination.

Such was the view of one school or class in the Christian Church. The opposite view, that the Pagan Mysteries were a mere abomination, is represented much more strongly in the Christian literature. There is not necessarily any contradiction between them. Ignatius felt, as we have said, that his Pagan life was a cause of lasting humiliation and shame to him, even though he was fully conscious that his religious sensibility had been developing through it. We need not doubt that he would have endorsed and approved every word of the charges which the Christian apologists made against the Mysteries. Both views are true, but both are partial: neither gives a complete statement of the case.

The mystic meaning that lay in even the grossest ceremonies of the Eleusinian and other Mysteries has been rightly insisted upon by Miss J. E. Harrison in her *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, especially chapter viii., a work well worthy of being studied. Miss Harrison has the philosophic insight which the ancients declare to be necessary in order to understand and learn from the Mysteries. Their evil side is to her non-existent, and the

old Christian writers who inveighed against the gross and hideous rites enacted in the Mysteries are repeatedly denounced by her in scathing terms as full of unclean imaginings—though she fully admits, of course, the truth of the facts which they allude to or describe in detail. Miss Harrison, standing on the lofty plane of philosophic idealism, can see only the mystic meaning, while she is too far removed above the mud and filth to be cognisant of it. To call an action of the ugliest character a "Holy Marriage" seems to her to be a sufficient justification of it. But to shut one's eyes to the evil does not annihilate it absolutely, though it may annihilate it for the few who shut their eyes. Plato in the Second Book of the *Republic* is as emphatic as Firmicus or Clemens in recognizing the harm that those ugly tales and acts of the gods did to the mass of the people. This must all be borne in mind while studying her brilliant work.

W. M. Ramsay.

ΦΘΙΝΟΠΩΡΙΝΟΣ [1]

The force of this word seems to me to have been generally misunderstood by the commentators on Jude 12, *δένδρα φθινοπωρινὰ ἄκαρπα δὶς ἀποθανόντα ἐκριζωθέντα*, where the A.V. has "trees whose fruit withereth," corrected in R.V. to "autumn trees." The former interpretation is retained in Weymouth's "trees that cast their fruit" (*The N.T. in Modern Speech*) and in Stier's "frugiperdae," "fruchtverderbenden." It is not denied that this is an entirely unexampled use of the word, but it is thought to be justified by the etymology, as illustrated by the parallel *δρῦς φθινόκαρπος* (Pindar, *P.* iv. 471) used of a tree which sheds its fruits before they ripen, and *φθινοπωρὶς ἀνέμων χειμερία καταπνόα* (Pindar, *P.* v. 161), "the fruit-withering blast of stormy winds," also by *ἰτέαι ὠλεσίκαρποι* (*Od.* x. 510). There can be no doubt, however, that *φθινοπωρινὸς* is an adjective [2] derived from *τὸ φθινόπωρον*, which is itself, I think, best explained as a compound of *φθίνουσα ὀπώρα* (cf. *φθίνοντος μηνὸς*), meaning the concluding portion of the *ὀπώρα*. This latter word is, according to Curtius, compounded of *ὀπ-*, connected with *ὀπίσω*, *ὄπισθεν*, and *ὥρα* = "the later prime." We find *ὥρα* used by itself both for the spring with its flowers and, more rarely, for the summer with its fruits, as in Thuc. ii. 52, *ὥρα ἔτους*. Perhaps from this double use of the word may have come the ambiguity in the application of *ὀπώρα*, of which Ideler says that "it originally indicated, not a season separate from and follow-

[1] In writing this paper I have made use of the article on *Astronomia* in the *D. of Ant.*, Ideler's *Handb. d. Chronologie*, G. F. Unger on *Zeitrechnung* in Iwan Müller's *Handb. d. klass. Altertumswiss.* vol. i. p. 561, and Ruehl's ed. of Schmidt's *Griech. Chronologie*, pp. 475–81. For the knowledge of the two latter I am indebted to Dr. Gow.

[2] Dr. Gow reminds me that the termination *-ινός* (so accented) is almost confined to adjectives of time, as *ἑαρινός*, *θερινός*, *χειμερινός*, *δειλινός*, *περυσινός*. The two apparent exceptions (*πεδινός*, *ἀληθινός*) are perhaps of different formation, cf. Brugmann, *Grundriss der Vergl.-Gramm.*, ii. pp. 135, 147.

ing after the summer, but the hottest part of the summer itself, so that Sirius, whose heliacal rising took place (in the age of Homer) about the middle of July, is described as *ἀστὴρ ὀπωρινὸς* (*Il.* v. 5)." In early times it would seem that the Greeks, like the Germans (Tac. *Germ.* 26), recognized only three seasons—winter, spring, summer; and that the last was indifferently named *θέρος* or *ὀπώρα*: compare Arist. *Aves*, 709, *πρῶτα μὲν ὥρας φαίνομεν ἡμεῖς ἦρος, χειμῶνος, ὀπώρας,* with Aesch. *Prom.* 453, *ἦν δ' οὐδὲν αὐτοῖς οὔτε χείματος τέκμαρ οὔτ' ἀνθεμώδους ἦρος οὔτε καρπιμου θέρους βέβαιον.* But though *ὀπώρα* was thus used strictly for the dog-days, when the fruit ripened, it was also vaguely used for the unnamed period which ensued up to the commencement of winter. Thus Hesiod (*Op.* 674), *μηδὲ μένειν οἰνόν τε νέον καὶ ὀπωρινὸν ὄμβρον καὶ χειμῶν' ἐπιόντα*: and *ὀπώρα* appears as a definite season by the side of the others in a line of Euripides, quoted by Plutarch (*Mor.* 1028 F), from which it appears that he assigned four months each to summer and winter, and two to spring and *ὀπώρα*[1]:—

φίλης τ' ὀπώρας διπτύχους, ἦρος τ' ἴσους

(where the epithet *φίλης* deserves notice). It is said that the author of the treatise *De Diaeta* (c. 420 B.C.), which goes under the name of Hippocrates, was the first to introduce a definite term (*φθινόπωρον* or *μετόπωρον*[2]) for the new season, the word *ὀπώρα* being reserved for the late summer, according to the definition of Eustath. on *Il.* v. 5, *ὀπώρα ὥρα μεταξὺ κειμένη θέρους καὶ τοῦ μετ' αὐτὴν μετοπώρου.* And so we find it used by Aristotle (*Meteor.* ii. 5, *αἱ χάλαζαι γίνονται ἔαρος μὲν καὶ μετοπώρου μάλιστα, εἶτα καὶ τῆς ὀπώρας, χειμῶνος δὲ ὀλιγάκις,* and by Theophrastus (*περὶ*

[1] Unger (p. 560) mentions others who shared this view. Among them, as will be seen, is the author of the *De Diaeta*.

[2] The word *μετοπωρινὸς* is found in our present text of Hesiod (*Op.* 415), *μετοπωρινὸν ὀμβρήσαντος Ζηνός.*

Σημείων, 44) *ἐὰν τὸ ἔαρ καὶ τὸ θέρος ψυχρὰ γίνηται, ἡ ὀπώρα γίνεται καὶ τὸ μετόπωρον πνιγηρόν.*[1]

There is a good deal of inconsistency about the exact limits of the seasons, as is natural enough when we remember that they were first distinguished for purposes of agriculture and navigation, as we see in Hesiod's *Works and Days*. Each season brings its own proper work, and the farmer or merchant is reminded of the return of the season by various signs, the rising and setting of stars, especially of the Pleiades and Arcturus, the sun's passage through the signs of the zodiac, the re-appearance of the birds, etc. A more strictly accurate division was made by the astronomers, who distinguished between the various kinds of rising and setting of the stars, and divided the year into four equal parts by the solstices and equinoxes. In the year 46 B.C. Julius Cæsar introduced his revised calendar, which assigned definite dates to the different seasons. Thus spring begins *a.d. vii. id. Feb.* (Feb. 7), summer *a.d. vii. id. Mai.* (May 9), autumn *a.d. iii. id. Sext.* (Aug. 11), winter *a.d. iv. id. Nov.* (Nov. 11).[2]

Taking the Julian calendar as our standard, as it was no doubt the generally accepted standard of the Roman world, we find that autumn begins on August 11 and ends on November 10. There are, however, other reckonings which it may be worth while to compare with this. Thus in the *Diaeta* we read (p. 366. 38) *φθινόπωρον ἀπὸ Ἀρκτούρου* (i.e. his morning rising about Sept. 15) *μεχρὶ Πλειάδων δύσεως* (the morning setting about Nov. 9), giving less than two months to this season. As the same treatise (Bk. iii. *init.*) says *τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ἐς τέσσαρα μέρεα διαιροῦσιν, ἅπερ μάλιστα*

[1] Ptolemy, *Appar.* (quoted by Schmidt) gives the limits of the *ὀπώρα* as follows: 21 July, *ὀπώρας ἀρχή*; 15 September, *μετοπώρου ἀρχή*.

[2] See Varro, *R.R.* i. 28 (where Keil quotes *Geoponica*, i. 1. 3, *μετόπωρον ἄρχεσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς πρὸ ἓξ εἰδῶν Αὐγούστων ἡλίου ὄντος ἐν λέοντι*); Columella, *R.R.* xi. 2. 57, 84; Plin. *N.H.* xviii. 68. 7; Ov. *Fasti*, ed. Peter, pp. 20–22.

γινάσκουσιν οἱ πολλοί . . . ἔαρ δὲ ἀπὸ ἰσημερίης (March 21) μεχρὶ Πλειάδων ἐπιτολῆς (May 10), his summer must have extended over more than four months. Another reckoning was that from the equinox to the solstice (Sept. 22 to Dec. 22). This does not seem to have been in such common use; the only Latin authority quoted for it in De Vit's *Forcellini* (*s.v.* "Autumnus") is Ulp. *Dig.* 43. 20. 1, § 32, "aestatem incipere sic peritiores (? the astronomers) ab aequinoctio verno, et finiri aequinoctio autumnali, et ita senis mensibus aestas atque hiems dividitur," and even here it is only stated that summer ends on the autumnal equinox, autumn and spring being entirely omitted. Yet Lewis and Short give this as though it were the only reckoning for autumn, while they further confuse the student by the statement that the Pleiades set on December 22 (instead of Nov. 9). Hesychius, quoted both by Stephanus and by Rost and Palm under *φθινόπωρος*, gives an equally unsatisfactory account of its duration, *ὁ ἀπὸ τῆς πεντεκαιδεκάτης Αὐγούστου μηνὸς ἕως τῆς πεντεκαιδεκάτης Δεκεμβρίου, οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς εἰκοστῆς δευτέρας Αὐγούστου ἕως πάλιν εἰκοστῆς δευτέρας Δεκεμβρίου*. Here it will be noticed that both reckonings give four months for autumn; and that, while the second reckoning agrees with the astronomers in ending the season with the winter solstice, it does not begin with the equinox. I think therefore that we should change the latter *Αὐγούστου* to *Σεπτεμβρίου*. [Since this was written I find that the same change is suggested by Unger.] If we make a similar correction in the earlier part of the sentence, changing the former *Δεκεμβρίου* to *Νοεμβρίου*, we get the ordinary agricultural reckoning.

To turn now to the commentators, I may take Trench as representing their view in his *Authorized Version*, p. 186, ed. 2, where he says, "The *φθινόπωρον* is the late autumn . . . which succeeds the *ὀπώρα* (or the autumn contemplated

as the time of the ripened fruits of the earth) and which has its name *παρὰ τὸ φθίνεσθαι τὴν ὀπώραν*, from the waning away of the autumn and the autumn fruits. . . . The deceivers of whom St. Jude speaks are likened to trees as they show in late autumn, when foliage and fruit alike are gone."

I have stated above what I hold to be the origin of the word *φθινόπωρον*. Trench's explanation is ambiguous and unsuited to the facts of the case, as will be seen from the criticisms in Lightfoot's *Fresh Revision*, p. 135: "In the phrase 'autumn-trees without fruit' there appears to be a reference to the parable of the fig-tree. . . . At all events the mention of the season when fruit might be expected is significant." He adds in a note, "Strange to say, the earliest versions all rendered *φθινοπωρινὰ* correctly.[1] Tyndale's instinct led him to give what I cannot but think the right turn to the expression, 'Trees with out frute at gadringe (gathering) time,' i.e. at the season when fruit was looked for. I cannot agree with Archbishop Trench, who maintains that 'Tyndale was feeling after, though he has not grasped, the right translation,' and himself explains *φθινοπωρινὰ ἄκαρπα* as 'mutually completing one another, *without leaves, without fruit.*' Tyndale was followed by Coverdale and the Great Bible. Similarly Wycliffe has 'hervest trees without fruyt,' and the Rheims Version 'trees of autumne unfruiteful.' The earliest offender is the Geneva Testament, which gives 'corrupt trees and without frute.' . . . The Bishops' Bible strangely combines both renderings, 'trees withered (*φθίνειν*) at fruite gathering (*ὀπώρα*) and without fruite,' which is explained in the margin, 'Trees withered in autumne when the fruite harvest is, and so the Greke woord importeth.'"

The correctness of the interpretation, given by Lightfoot alone among modern commentators, is confirmed by a con-

[1] This agreement is probably owing to their dependence on the Vulgate "*arbores autumnales infructuosae.*"

sideration of the context. The writer has just been comparing the innovators, who have crept into other Churches, to waterless clouds driven past by the wind. Just as these disappoint the hope of the husbandman, so do fruitless trees in the proper season of fruit. If *φθινοπωρινὰ* were equivalent to *χειμερινὰ*, denoting the season when the trees are necessarily bare both of leaves and fruit, how could a tree be blamed for being *ἄκαρπον*? It is because it might have been, and ought to have been a fruit-bearing tree, that it is rooted up.

If we follow the Julian calendar, Trench's interpretation is evidently impossible. Even if we suppose St. Jude to have been familiar with the scientific calendar, which makes autumn begin with the equinox; since leaves and fruits would even then not be cleared from the trees till autumn was more than half through; and since the first part of the compound *φθινόπωρον* has already spent its force in the change from the dog-days (*ὀπώρα*) to the autumn, and cannot act again (as Trench supposes) to change autumn into late-autumn, it follows that *φθινοπωρινὰ* would have been a most unsuitable word to express the bareness of winter. How unsuitable it would have been, how little corresponding to the *Spätherbst* and *senescens autumnus* of the commentators, will be evident from the way in which autumn is spoken of in the Greek romances. The scene of Longus' *Pastoralia* is laid in this season: in i. 30 he speaks of the temperature as *ἔτι τῆς ὥρας οὔσης καυματώδους*, in i. 28 of the ripening of the grapes *μετοπώρου δ' ἀκμάζοντος καὶ τοῦ βότρυος*. At the beginning of Book ii. the vintage is described, and in the third chapter we are introduced to a shepherd who speaks of the produce of his garden at different seasons, *ἦρος ῥόδα, κρίνα . . . θέρους μήκωνες καὶ μῆλα πάντα· νῦν ἄμπελοι καὶ συκαῖ καὶ ῥοιαὶ καὶ μύρτα χλωρά*. Similarly Philostratus (*Heroic.* i. 5) dwells on the delights of autumn, *ὡς ποικίλη*

σοι ἡ ὥρα καὶ ὡς ἐκδεδώκασιν ἱλαροὶ οἱ βότρυς, τὰ δένδρα θ' ὡς διάκειται πάντα καὶ ὡς ἀμβροσία ἡ ὀσμὴ τοῦ χωρίου, ib. 6 τρωκτὰ δ' ὡραῖα προτίθεμαι ἐπειδὰν θέρος θ' ἥκῃ καὶ μετόπωρον ἵστηται. We may compare the saying attributed to Euripides (Ael. *V.H.* xiii. 4), οὐ μόνον τὸ ἔαρ τῶν καλῶν κάλλιστον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ μετόπωρον; Hor. *C.* iv. 7. 11, pomifer autumnus fruges effuderit, *Ep.* ii. 17 decorum mitibus pomis caput autumnus agris extulit, Macrobius (*Somn. Scip.* i. 20. 6) mollities autumnalis aurae.

J. B. Mayor.

TRANSLATIONS FROM THE PROPHETS.

VIII.

Jeremiah XVI. 10.–XX. 18.

*The reason for these threatened Judgements is the People's Idolatry.**

10 And it shall come to pass, when thou shalt declare unto this people all these words, and they shall say unto thee, 'Wherefore hath Yahweh pronounced all this great evil against us? or what is our iniquity, or what is our sin, wherewith we have sinned against Yahweh our God?' 11 that thou shalt say unto them, 'Because your fathers have forsaken me, saith Yahweh, and have walked after other gods, and have served them, and have worshipped them, but me they have forsaken, and my law they have not kept; 12 and *ye* have done evil more than your fathers; for, behold, ye walk every one after the stubbornness of his evil heart, so that ye hearken not unto me.' 13 And I will hurl you forth out of this land into the land that ye know not, neither ye nor your fathers; and there shall ye serve other gods day and night; for I will grant you no favour.

* The immediate sequel to 16. 1–9 (see the Expositor for May, 1903, p. 365 f.).

*A Parenthesis containing a Promise of ultimate Restoration.**

14 Therefore, behold, the days come, saith Yahweh, that it shall no more be said, 'As Yahweh liveth, which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt'; 15 but, 'As Yahweh liveth, which brought up the children of Israel from the north country, and from all the countries whither he had driven them': and I will bring them back into their land that I gave unto their fathers.

The Fate which ere long will overtake the People.

16 Behold, I will send many fishers, saith Yahweh, and they shall fish them; and afterward I will send many hunters, and they shall hunt them, from every mountain, and from every hill, and out of the chinks of the rocks. 17 For mine eyes are upon all their ways: they are not hid from my face, neither is their iniquity concealed from mine eyes. 18 And† I will recompense their iniquity and their sin double; because they have polluted my land with the dead bodies of their detestable things,‡ and have filled mine inheritance with their abominations.

Yahweh is the Prophet's Hope and Strength; and the Time will come when He will be recognized, even by the Heathen, as the true God. Meanwhile Judah will be taught by Yahweh, who it is that they have rejected.

19 O Yahweh, my strength and my stronghold, and my

* These two verses recur (with slight verbal differences) in 23. 7, 8, where they form a suitable close to the preceding prophecy. It is doubtful whether they originally stood here at all; for the context, on both sides, relates to Judah's approaching exile, and *vv.* 16–18 continue the line of thought of *vv.* 10–13.

† So LXX. The Heb. text adds *first*, which must mean, before the restoration promised in *vv.* 14, 15. But the word harmonizes badly with the thought of *vv.* 17, 18; and most probably it is a gloss, added after *vv.* 14, 15 were inserted in their present place.

‡ I.e. of their idols (see on 4. 1, and cf. 7. 30), called 'dead bodies' in contempt (cf. Lev. 26. 30).

refuge in the day of trouble, unto thee shall nations come from the ends of the earth, and shall say, 'Only lies have our fathers inherited, (even) vanity, and things among which there is none that profiteth.'* [20] Should a man make gods unto himself, which yet are no gods? [21] Therefore, behold, I will cause them to know, this once will I cause them to know mine hand and my might; and they shall know that my name is Yahweh.

Judah's Sin is indelible; and will be followed by condign Punishment.

XVII. [1] The sin of Judah is written with a pen of iron,† (and) with the point of a diamond: it is graven upon the tablet of their heart, and upon the horns of their‡ altars; § [2] when their children remember their altars and their Ashérim‖ by the spreading trees¶ upon the high hills.** [3] O

* Cf. 2. 8, 11, 1 Sam. 12. 21, Isa. 44. 10.

† Used for incising indelible characters on hard surfaces: cf. Job 19. 24.

‡ So LXX. The Heb. text has *your*.

§ Upon which, in rites of atonement, some of the blood was put (Lev. 4. 7, 18, 25, etc.). But here they are represented as polluted by the blood of idolatrous sacrifices.

‖ The 'Ashérah' was a roughly-hewn wooden pole,—representing, it is probable, a sacred tree,—planted beside an altar, and condemned by the spiritually-minded Israelites on account of its heathen associations: see Ex. 34. 13, Deut. 12. 3, 16. 21, 1 Kings 14. 15, 23, 2 Kings 21. 3, 7, etc.

¶ Often alluded to as places of idolatrous rites: Deut. 12. 2, 1 Kings 14. 23, Jer. 2. 20, 3. 6, 13, etc.

** The meaning is supposed to be (Graf), when their children, beside every spreading tree, and every high hill, remember the altars and Ashérim, by which their fathers sinned: this is evidence how deeply engraven upon the heart of the nation its sin is. But the sense thus obtained is forced. Keil renders: As (they) think of their children (so they think of) their altars, etc.; they are as devoted to them as to their own children: but this requires more to be supplied than is legitimate. There must be some error in the text, though we cannot be sure exactly where it lies. Duhm supposes that the words, *when their children remember their altars and their Ashérim*, are a gloss, added by a later hand, to illustrate how inveterate Israel's sin must have been if even generations living long afterwards still thought of their fathers' idolatries: if this view be adopted the whole passage will run:

my mountain in the field,* thy substance (and) all thy treasures I will give for a spoil, (and) thy high places, because of sin, throughout all thy borders. [4] And thou shalt withdraw thine hand from† thine heritage that I gave thee; and I will cause thee to serve thine enemies in the land which thou knowest not: for ye have kindled a fire in mine anger, which shall burn for ever.‡

It is useless to trust in Man: Yahweh, to those who put their trust in Him and act righteously (vv. 9–11), is the sole Source of Strength in the Hour of Trouble.

[5] Thus saith Yahweh: Cursed is the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, but whose heart from Yahweh turneth aside. [6] He shall be like a juniper tree§ in the steppe, and shall not see when good cometh; but he shall inhabit parched places in the wilderness, a salt land and not inhabited.

[7] Blessed is the man that trusteth in Yahweh, and whose confidence Yahweh is. [8] He shall be as a tree planted by the waters, and that stretcheth out its roots to the stream, and he shall not fear‖ when heat cometh, but his leaf shall be spreading; and in the year of drought he shall not be

The sin of Judah is written with a pen of iron,
With the point of a diamond is it graven upon the tablet of their heart,
Upon the horns of their altars, upon [every] spreading tree,
Upon the high hills, the mountains in the field (see the note on *v.* 3).

* If the text is correct, a designation of Jerusalem (cf. 21. 13). But the designation is a very strange one, and perhaps the words, pointed so as to mean 'the mountains in the field' (cf. 13. 27 'on the hills in the field'), should be attached to the end of *v.* 2: see the last note.

† Heb. *let thy hand fall* (or *drop*) *from*: see Ex. 23. 11 (R.V.), Deut. 15. 2, 3. The rend. implies a change of two letters (וידך for ונבך): 'and that through thyself,' (R.V.) for ונבך is a most questionable rendering; nor does שמט mean to 'discontinue.'

‡ *Vv.* 3, 4*b* are repeated largely, with slight variations, from 15. 13, 14.

§ Probably the dwarf juniper tree, whose gloomy, stunted appearance, with its leaves often cropped close by wild goats, would well suit the comparison (Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, 358).

‖ So LXX. Vulg. The Heb. text, as pointed, has, *shall not see.*

anxious, neither shall he cease from yielding fruit. [9] The heart is deceitful above all things, and it is desperately sick: who can know it? [10] I Yahweh search the heart, (and) try the reins; and give unto every man according to his ways, according to the fruit of his doings. [11] (Like) a partridge that gathereth (young) which she hath not brought forth,* is he that getteth riches, but not by right: in the midst of his days he shall leave them, and at his end he shall be a fool.† [12] A glorious throne, on high from the beginning, is the place of our sanctuary! [13] O Yahweh, the hope of Israel, all that forsake thee shall be put to shame; they that turn aside from thee‡ shall be written in earth,§ because they have forsaken Yahweh, the fountain of running waters.‖

* Alluding, it is supposed, to a popular belief (arising perhaps out of the unusually large number of eggs laid by it) that the partridge brooded on eggs which were not its own: the young birds soon forsake their false mother, and so does wealth its unjust possessor. Or perhaps the words should be rendered, *that gathereth* (eggs) *and doth not bring forth* (young)—with allusion to the large number of eggs laid by the partridge, which are eagerly sought for by the Arabs as food, so that the bird often hatches no young (Tristram, *NHB.* 224 f.). The word rendered *gathereth* (דגר) occurs otherwise in the O.T. only in Isa. 34. 15*a*, where, as the text stands, it clearly refers to the *young*. To judge, however, from its use in Mandaic (Payne Smith, *Thes. Syr.*, col. 823), and the Targ. of Job 39. 14 (of eggs), and from the subst. דגורא *a heap* in the Targums (e.g. Ex. 8. 10), it will have meant *to heap together*, and be more applicable to the eggs than to the young; so that there is much to be said for the view of Cheyne and Marti that in Isa. 34. 15 'hatch' and 'gather' have become accidentally transposed.

† I.e. he will show himself to be morally and spiritually blinded (the word does not mean 'fool' in an intellectual sense: see the glossary in my *Parallel Psalter*, p. 457).

‡ So Vulg. Targ. The Heb. text has *me* (one letter dropped out).

§ I.e. (if the text is correct) in a soft substance from which their names will soon be obliterated. But the expression is a strange one, and the text is open to suspicion. Plausible emendations are, 'they that turn aside from thee in the land *shall be put to confusion*,' and 'they that turn aside from thee *shall be cut off from the earth*' (Ps. 34. 17). The comparison of Luke 10. 20, cited in the R.V. with marginal references, throws no light upon the passage: it implies an antithesis of which Jeremiah would know nothing. The explanation of the text given here is that of Payne Smith, Plumptre, Streane, and modern commentators generally.

‖ See 2. 13.

The Prophet prays to be delivered from those who taunt and persecute him.

14 Heal me, Yahweh, and I shall be healed; save me,
and I shall be saved: for thou art my praise. 15 Behold,
they say unto me, 'Where is the word of Yahweh? let it
come, pray.'* 16 As for me, I have not hastened from being
a shepherd † after thee; neither have I desired the woeful
day; *thou* knowest: that which came out of my lips was
before thy face.‡ 17 Be not a (cause of) dismay unto me:
thou art my refuge in the day of evil. 18 Let them be put
to shame that persecute me, but let not *me* be put to shame:
let *them* be dismayed, but let not *me* be dismayed: bring
upon them the day of evil, and destroy them with double
destruction.§

An Exhortation to observe the Sabbath.

19 Thus said Yahweh unto me: Go and stand in the gate
of the children of the people, whereby the kings of Judah
come in, and by the which they go out,‖ and in all the
gates of Jerusalem; 20and say unto them, Hear ye the
word of Yahweh, ye kings of Judah, and all Judah, and all
the inhabitants of Jerusalem that enter in by these gates;
thus saith Yahweh; Take heed to¶ yourselves, and bear no

* With the taunting question, cf. Isa. 5. 19, Ezek. 12. 22.

† Fig. for a *prophet*—an application which does not occur elsewhere. Giesebrecht and Duhm, vocalizing one word (with Aq. Symm.) differently, read, *I have not pressed after thee because of evil*, i.e., I have not followed after thee for the sake of urging thee to hasten on the evil day; the clause will then be parallel with the following one.

‡ Jer. protests that he has not shrunk from following Yahweh as a prophet, or announced the day of woe, because (as his enemies declared) he desired it: Yahweh *knows* that he is speaking the truth; why, then, should He abandon him to his foes?

§ Heb. *break them with a double breaking.*

‖ A gate, apparently (see Ezek. 44. 1, 3*b*, 46. 1*a*, 2) either the outer or the inner gate on the East, by which the kings entered and left the Temple.

¶ So, changing a letter (see Deut. 4. 15, Josh. 23. 11). The text has *in.*

burden on the sabbath day, nor bring it in by the gates of Jerusalem; [22] neither carry forth a burden out of your houses on the sabbath day, neither do ye any work; * but hallow ye the sabbath day, as I commanded your fathers; [23] but they hearkened not, neither inclined their ear, but made their neck stiff, that they might not hear, and might not receive instruction.† [24] And it shall come to pass, if ye diligently hearken unto me, saith Yahweh, to bring in no burden through the gates of this city on the sabbath day, but to hallow the sabbath day, to do no work therein; [25] then shall there enter in by the gates of this city kings [and princes]‡ sitting upon the throne of David, riding in chariots and on horses, they and their princes, the men of Judah, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem: and this city shall be inhabited§ for ever. [26] And they shall come from the cities of Judah, and from the places round about Jerusalem, and from the land of Benjamin, and from the lowland, and from the hill country, and from the South,‖ bringing burnt offerings, and sacrifices, and oblations, and frankincense, and bringing (sacrifices of) thanksgiving¶ unto the house of Yahweh. [27] But if ye hearken not unto me to hallow the sabbath day, and not to bear a burden and enter in at the gates of Jerusalem on the sabbath day, I will kindle a fire

* Properly *business*. So always in this connexion (except Ex. 23. 12).

† Or, *correction*. See 2. 30; and cf. on 6. 8.

‡ The bracketed words are here out of place: 'princes' would not be sitting on the throne, or have 'their princes' under them. They must be an addition, older than the LXX., which has crept in from a reminiscence of 2. 26, 25. 18, 32. 32, 44. 17, 21. For 'kings sitting,' etc., comp. 13. 13, 22. 4.

§ Heb. *shall sit*. A city or land, when it is inhabited, is said in Heb. to 'sit'; so *v.* 6, Isa. 13. 20, Jer. 50. 13, 39 *al.*

‖ Three districts of Judah: the low hills and flat valley-land stretching down towards the Philistine plain on the W. and S.W.; the elevated 'hill country' about Hebron; and the Negeb (see on 13. 19), or the 'South.' See Josh. 15. 33–44; 48–60; 21–32: and cf. Deut. 1. 7, Josh. 10. 40, Jer. 32. 44, 33. 13.

¶ Comp. 33. 11; and see Lev. 7. 12, 22. 19.

in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem,* and not be quenched.

JEREMIAH XVIII.

A Lesson from the Potter.

XVIII. [1] The word which came to Jeremiah from Yahweh, saying, [2] Arise, and go down to the potter's house, and there I will cause thee to hear my words. [3] So I went down to the potter's house, and, behold, he was doing (his) work upon the wheels.† [4] And if the vessel that he was making of the clay was marred in the hand of the potter, he would make it again into another vessel, as seemed good to the potter to make it.

As the Potter, if the Need arises, can change the Vessel that he is making into another, so can Yahweh deal with His people: if it repents, He can withdraw His Threats; if it does Evil, He can revoke His Promises.

[5] Then the word of Yahweh came unto me, saying, [6] O house of Israel, cannot I do with you as this potter? saith Yahweh. Behold, as the clay in the potter's hand, so are ye in mine hand, O house of Israel. [7] At one moment I speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to break down, and to destroy it; [8] but if that nation, concerning which I have spoken, turn from its evil, then I repent of the evil that I thought to do unto it. [9] And at another moment I speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and

* These words (only the places mentioned being different) recur 21. 14*b*, 49. 27, 50. 32. They are based (like Hos. 8. 14) upon the refrain in Amos 1. 4, 7, 10, 12, 14, 2. 2, 5.

† Heb. *on the two* (circular) *stones*, the lower one being turned by the feet, and the upper (on the same vertical axle) supporting the clay. See the illustration in *Enc. Bibl.* iii. 3820 (Fig. 8), or Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, Southern Pal., p. 35 (in the one vol. ed., p. 521).

to plant it; [10] but if it do evil in my sight, that it hearken not to my voice, then I repent of the good, wherewith I said I would benefit it.

Let Judah, then, repent, in order that the threatened Doom may be averted.

[11] Now, therefore, go to, speak to the men of Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, saying, Thus saith Yahweh: Behold I am framing* evil against you, and devising a device against you: turn ye, now, every one from his evil way, and make your ways and your doings good.

But Judah refuses to repent; and so the Judgement originally pronounced is re-affirmed.

[12] But they say, 'There is no hope:† for we will walk after our own devices, and we will do every one (after) the imagination of his evil heart.' [13] Therefore thus saith Yahweh: Ask ye, now, among the nations, who hath heard such things? the virgin of Israel hath done very greatly an horrible thing. [14] Doth the snow of Lebanon leave‡ the rock of the field?§ or are the cold ‖ flowing streams dried up?¶ [15] For my people have forgotten me, they burn

* Or, *forming*, *moulding*, the verb of which 'potter' (lit. *former*, *moulder*) is the participle, and which is often used in Heb. in various fig. applications: e.g. Ps. 94. 9, 20, Isa. 37. 26, Jer. 10. 16, 33. 2.

† Cf. 2. 25.

‡ So, omitting a letter. The Heb. text has, *leave from*.

§ I.e. (if the text is correct) Lebanon itself, rising up out of the level land around it. But the expression is a strange one, and Duhm would read, *Doth the hoar frost leave Sirion* (Ps. 29. 6—the Phœnician name of Hermon, Deut. 3. 9), *the snow Lebanon*? (שרין כפור for מצור שדי).

‖ The Heb. text inserts *strange*, in R.V. paraphrased by 'that come from afar' (זרים, a faulty anticipation of the following קרים, 'cold').

¶ So, transposing two letters. The Heb. text has *plucked up* (viz., like a tree: unsuitable to 'waters'). The text of this verse is in parts open to suspicion, but the general sense is clear. The snow of Lebanon never fails; its gushing streams (Cant. 4. 15) never dry up (cf. *Enc. Bibl.* iii. 2757: what a contrast to Israel's fickleness (*v.* 15)!

incense unto worthlessness;* and they have been made to stumble in their ways, in the old tracks,† to walk in by-paths, in a way not cast up; [16] to make their land an appalment,‡ and a perpetual hissing; everyone that passeth by it shall be appalled, and shake his head. [17] I will scatter them like a sirocco § before the enemy; I will look upon them with the back, and not the face, ‖ in the day of their calamity.

The People, resenting this unwelcome Conclusion of the Prophet's, propose to form Plots against his Life.

[18] Then said they, 'Come, and let us devise devices against Jeremiah; for direction ¶ shall not perish from the priest, nor counsel from the wise, nor the word from the prophet.** Come, and let us smite him with the tongue,†† and let us not give heed to any of his words.'

* Or, *unreality* (see the Glossary to my *Parallel Psalter*, p. 464); here a term of opprobrium for false gods: cf. Hos. 5. 11, where the same word, שׁוא should be read with LXX, Pesh. (cf. R.V. *marg.*); and הבל, a 'breath, fig. 'vanity,' also of false gods, Jer. 2. 5, 8. 19, 16. 19 *al.*

† Cf. 6. 16.

‡ Or, *a desolation.*

§ A scorching, suffocating, and destructive wind, which in Palestine and adjoining countries is apt to spring up suddenly, with great violence, from the desert on the E. or S.E (see descriptions in my note on Am. 4. 9). This is always what is meant by 'east wind' in the O.T. (cf. Gen. 41. 6 [notice 'blasted']; Job 27. 21; Hos. 13. 15), though the term used cannot be said to suggest it to an English reader, who would never think of associating an 'east wind' with heat. ('Sirocco' means *eastern*, being a corruption of the Arab. *sherkiyeh.*)

‖ Compare the people's treatment of Yahweh, 2. 27.

¶ See the note on 8. 8 (Feb. 1903, p. 152). What is meant is instruction to the laity on points of ceremonial observance: cf. Deut. 24. 9 (where 'teach' is properly 'direct,' as here); Hag. 2. 11–13 ('Ask, now, *direction* of the priests,' etc.).

** They cannot imagine that the time will ever come when, as Jeremiah declared, the State would come to an end, and the priest, the wise man, and the prophet be no longer able to fulfil their various vocations. Cf. Ezek. 7. 26.

†† I.e. bring some serious accusation against him, such as a charge of treason.

Jeremiah's Prayer that their Plots against him may be frustrated.

19 Give heed to me, Yahweh, and hearken to the voice of them that contend with me. 20 Should evil be recompensed for good? for they have digged a pit for my soul. Remember how I stood before thee to speak good for them, to turn back thy fury from them. 21 Therefore deliver up their children to the famine, and give them over to the power of the sword; * and let their wives become childless, and widows; and let their men be slain of death, † (and) their young men smitten of the sword in battle. 22 Let a cry be heard from their houses, when thou shalt bring a troop suddenly upon them: for they have digged a pit to take me, and traps have they hidden for my feet. 23 Yet thou, Yahweh, knowest all their counsel against me to slay me: forgive not their iniquity, neither blot out their sin from thy sight, but let them be overthrown ‡ before thee; deal thou with them in the time of thine anger.

Jeremiah XIX.–XX.

The Lesson of the broken Cruse, and its Consequences. Jeremiah, prophesying in the Valley of the Son of Hinnom, teaches, by an effective Symbolism, that the Disaster, impending upon the Nation, will be final and irretrievable.

XIX. 1 Thus saith Yahweh, Go and buy a potter's earthen cruse, § and take ‖ of the elders of the people, and of the elders of the priests; 2 and go forth unto the valley of the son of Hinnom, which is by the entry of the pot-

* Heb. *spill them into the hands of the sword*; so Ezek. 35. 5, Ps. 63. 10 (Heb. 11).

† I.e. death by pestilence, as 15. 2.

‡ Heb. *made to stumble*: cf. 6. 15, 21.

§ See 1 Kings 14. 3.

‖ So LXX. The word has dropped accidentally out of the Heb. text.

sherd gate,* and proclaim there the words that I shall tell thee: [3] and say, Hear ye the word of Yahweh, O kings of Judah, and inhabitants of Jerusalem; Thus saith Yahweh of hosts, the God of Israel: Behold, I bring evil upon this place, the which whosoever heareth, his ears shall tingle.† [4] Because they have forsaken me, and have treated this place as foreign,‡ and have burned incense in it unto other gods, whom they knew not, they or their fathers or the kings of Judah; and have filled § this place with the blood of innocents: || [5] and have built the high places of Baal, to burn their sons in the fire [for burnt-offerings unto Baal],¶ which I commanded not, nor spake it, neither came it into my mind: ** [6] therefore, behold, the days come, saith Yahweh, that this place shall no more be called Topheth, nor The valley of the son of Hinnom, but The valley of Slaughter.†† [7] And I will make void ‡‡ the counsel of Judah and Jerusalem in this place; and I will cause them to fall by the sword before their enemies, and by the hands of them that seek their life: and their carcases will I give to be food for the fowls of the heaven, and for the beasts of the earth. [8] And I will make this city an appalment, and an hissing; every one that passeth by it shall be appalled and hiss because of all the

* Probably a gate near which broken earthenware, etc., was thrown.

† See for the expression 1 Sam. 3. 11; 2 Kings 21. 12.

‡ Or, *have made this place foreign*,—in either case, with allusion to the foreign gods (5. 19, 8. 19), and foreign modes of worship introduced into it. We might say now, *denationalized*.

§ Read probably with LXX. (omitting 'and'), *they or their fathers; and the kings of Judah have filled*, etc.

|| See 2. 34; and 2 Kings 21. 16, 24. 4 (both of Manasseh).

¶ These words, which are not in the LXX., should probably be omitted. From 32. 35 (a very similar passage), it seems that these offerings were made to Molech, not to Baal. Cf. 7. 31.

** Heb. *came up upon my heart*, idiom. for 'occurred to me.' So Isa. 65. 17, Jer. 3. 16, 7. 31 *al.*; Acts 7. 23.

†† Cf. 7. 32.

‡‡ Heb. *empty out* (used fig. as Isa. 19. 3), from *bāḳaḳ*, the word being suggested by *baḳbūḳ*, 'cruse,' in *v.* 1. Comp. similar plays in chap. 1. 12, 14 (amended text), Am. 8. 2.

strokes* thereof. [9] And I will cause them to eat the flesh of their sons and the flesh of their daughters, and they shall eat every one the flesh of his neighbour, in the siege and in the straitness, wherewith their enemies, and they that seek their life, shall straiten them.† [10] Then shalt thou break the cruse in the sight of the men that go with thee, [11] and shalt say unto them, Thus saith Yahweh of hosts: Even so will I break this people and this city, as one breaketh a potter's vessel, that cannot be made whole again: and they shall bury in Topheth, because there shall be no place (else) to bury. [12] Thus will I do unto this place, saith Yahweh, and to the inhabitants thereof, and I will make this city as Topheth: [13] and the houses of Jerusalem, and the houses of the kings of Judah, shall be like the place of Topheth, unclean,‡ even all the houses upon whose roofs they have burned incense unto all the host of heaven,§ and have poured out drink-offerings unto other gods.

Jeremiah repeats in the Court of the Temple the Substance of what he had said in the Valley of the Son of Hinnom.

[14] Then came Jeremiah from Topheth, whither Yahweh had sent him to prophesy; and he stood in the court of Yahweh's house; and said to all the people: [15] Thus saith Yahweh of hosts, the God of Israel, Behold I bring upon this city and upon all her towns all the evil that I have pronounced against it, because they have made their neck stiff, that they might not hear my words.

* The word rendered *wound* in 10. 19, 14. 17, 15. 18, 30. 14, 17 (see for the meaning 1 Kings 22. 35; 2 Kings 8. 29). *Plague*, here and in other similar passages of both A.V. and R.V. (49. 17, 50. 13; Deut. 28. 59, 61, 29. 22), must be understood in its etymological sense of a severe *stroke*, or *blow* (πληγή).

† From Deut. 28. 53.

‡ So, omitting a letter. The Heb. text has *the unclean* (plural).

§ Cf. 32. 29, Zeph. 1. 5, 2 Kings 23. 12.

Pashḥur, the Superintendent of the Temple, has Jeremiah thrown into the Stocks, on account of his Predictions of Disaster. After his release, Jeremiah again emphatically repeats his Predictions, declaring in particular that Pashḥur himself will both witness and share in the Exile in which he professed to disbelieve.

XX. [1] Now Pashḥur, the son of Immer, the priest, who was overseer * in Yahweh's house, heard Jeremiah prophesying these things. [2] Then Pashḥur smote Jeremiah the prophet, and put him in the stocks that were in the upper Benjamin-gate, † which was in Yahweh's house. [3] And it came to pass on the morrow, that Pashḥur brought forth Jeremiah out of the stocks. Then said Jeremiah unto him, Yahweh hath called thy name not Pashḥur, but Magor-missabib.‡ [4] For thus saith Yahweh, Behold, I will make thee a terror to thyself, and to all thy friends; § and they shall fall by the sword of their enemies, and thine eyes shall behold it: and all Judah will I give into the hand of the king of Babylon, and he shall carry them into exile to Babylon, and shall slay them with the

* The Heb. text has *overseer, ruler*: but the expression is peculiar; and 'ruler' is probably a gloss, identifying Jeremiah's 'overseer' (see 29. 26) with the 'ruler' often mentioned in later times in connexion with the Temple, 1 Chron. 9. 11 (=Neh. 11. 11), 2 Chron. 31. 13, 35. 8.

† Probably the N. gate (the territory of Benjamin being on the N. of Jerusalem) of the inner court of the Temple, which, as the Temple was at the top of the hill of Zion, was higher than the larger 'outer' court surrounding it, and is called the 'upper' court in chap. 36. 10, the gate from the N. leading into it being called similarly the 'upper' gate in Ezek. 9. 2, 2 Kings 15. 35.

‡ I.e. *Terror on every side*: cf. *v.* 10, 6. 25, 46. 5, 49. 29; Lam. 2. 22.

§ Pashḥur and his friends represented a policy opposed to that of Jeremiah: they believed that fear of the Chaldæans was groundless, and that with the help of Egypt, Judah would be able to resist them successfully. The name here given to him is intended to describe partly the consternation of which he will be the centre, partly the consternation which he will experience himself, when the fatal consequences of his policy have become apparent to all in the fall of the city, and exile of the nation, at the hands of the Chaldæans.

sword. [5] And I will give all the store of this city, and all the gains thereof, and all the precious things thereof, yea, all the treasures of the kings of Judah will I give into the hand of their enemies, and they shall spoil them, and take them, and carry them to Babylon. [6] And thou, Pashḥur, and all that dwell in thine house shall go into captivity: and unto Babylon shalt thou come, and there shalt thou die, and there shalt thou be buried, thou, and all thy friends, to whom thou hast prophesied falsely.

Jeremiah complains bitterly of his Lot: he could not but give Utterance to the Divine Word burning within him, yet it had brought him nothing but Hostility and Misrepresentation.

[7] Thou hast beguiled* me, Yahweh, and I let myself be beguiled;* thou art stronger than I, and hast prevailed: I am become a laughingstock all the day, every one mocketh me. [8] For as often as I speak, I cry out; I cry, 'Violence and spoil!' because the word of Yahweh is become to me a reproach, and a derision all the day. [9] And if I say, 'I will not think of it, nor speak any more in his name,' then there is in mine heart as it were a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I am weary with holding in,† and I cannot (contain). [10] For I hear the defaming of many, terror on every side!‡ 'Report, and we will report him,'§ (say) all my familiar friends,‖ they that watch for my halting;¶

* Or, *persuaded* (Prov. 25. 15). Jeremiah means to say that he has been over-persuaded by Yahweh to become His prophet, and beguiled into a position fraught with vexations and disappointments which he never anticipated.

† Or, *enduring*.

‡ Cf. Ps. 31. 13, where these words are quoted.

§ Viz. to the authorities, on a charge of treason (see 26. 11).

‖ Heb. *the men of my peace* (as 38. 22; Ps. 41. 9).

¶ I.e. for my *limping*, fig. for *fatal step*, *ruin* (cf. Ps. 35. 15, 38. 17).

'peradventure he will be beguiled,* and we shall prevail against him, and take our vengeance on him.'

Nevertheless, he is sustained and encouraged by the Conviction that Yahweh is with him, and will in the End grant him Justice against his Persecutors.

[11] But Yahweh is with me as a mighty one (and) a terrible :† therefore my persecutors shall stumble, and not prevail: they shall be put greatly to shame, because they have not dealt wisely, with a perpetual confusion, which shall never be forgotten.‡ [12] But, O Yahweh of hosts, that triest the righteous, that seest the reins and the heart, let me see thy vengeance on them: for unto thee have I revealed my cause.§ [13] Sing unto Yahweh, praise ye Yahweh: for he hath delivered the soul of the needy from the hand of evildoers.‖

A renewed Outburst of Grief and Despair, which now wring from him the Wish that he had never been born (cf. Job iii.).

[14] Cursed be the day wherein I was born: let not the day wherein my mother bare me be blessed. [15] Cursed be the man who brought tidings to my father, saying, 'A man child is born unto thee'; making him very glad. [16] And let that man be as the cities which Yahweh overthrew,¶

* Or, *persuaded*; viz. into saying unguardedly something that might be construed as treasonable, and lead to his being reported to the government. Jeremiah's conviction that the safety of Judah depended upon submission to the Chaldæans, caused him to be regarded by many as unpatriotic, and to be suspected of treason.

† I.e. as a fear-inspiring warrior,—the regular sense of *gibbōr*, 'mighty man,' in Heb. (2 Sam. 23. 8, etc.; of Yahweh, as here, Ps. 24. 8, Isa. 42. 13: contrast Jer. 14. 9).

‡ Cf. 23. 40.

§ Repeated from 11. 20.

‖ A jubilant thanksgiving, uttered in the certainty of his coming deliverance.

¶ I.e. Sodom and Gomorrah: see Gen. 19. 25.

and repented not; and let him hear a cry * in the morning, and the (war-)shout † at noontide: [17] because he slew me not in ‡ the womb, that so my mother should have been my grave, and her womb always great. [18] Wherefore came I forth from the womb to see labour and sorrow, that my days should be consumed with shame?

* I.e. the cry of his household and friends, attacked by the foe.

† See 4. 19; and cf. 15. 8.

‡ So LXX. Pesh. The Heb. text has *from* (מ for ב), which suits Job 3. 11, but does not here agree with the sequel. For ותהי, as also for ויכלו in *v.* 18, cf. Gen. 31. 27; and see my *Tenses*, § 74.

S. R. Driver.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE EMMAUS INCIDENT.

The narrative of the manifestation of Christ to two disciples on the way to Emmaus is not only one of the most beautiful and interesting passages in the Gospel according to St. Luke, but it is also one of the most theologically important. It is in fact the Gospel according to Christ Himself. And the lines on which this protevangel is delivered became the model, both in regard to form and matter, of the other deliverances of the Gospel, both oral and written, which have been handed down in the Church. As yet indeed the coping stone of the proof of the Resurrection was needed. All else the two disciples had in their possession. But what was to them a story of disappointed hope, Jesus by His teaching and interpretation of prophecy, and finally by His gracious manifestation of Himself, converted into a gospel of joy and salvation.

In the first place He elicited from the two disciples, who had been "eye-witnesses and ministers of the word," the narrative of facts which had passed into their experience. They told him of Jesus of Nazareth, a prophet mighty in deed and word, of His condemnation and death, of their hope that it was He who should redeem Israel, and lastly of the angels' message brought to them by women, but unconfirmed, and evidently doubted, that Jesus was still alive.

At this point Jesus, still unrecognized by the disciples, begins to teach, first rebuking them for slowness in spiritual insight: "Behoved it not (οὐχὶ ἔδει) the Christ to suffer these things and to enter into His glory? And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, He interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning Himself" (Luke xxiv. 26–28).

The words of our Lord in verses 44–48 of the same

chapter, although used on a different occasion, are implicitly contained in the passage we are considering, which is of course a summary only of what our Lord said to the disciples. We are justified then in adding to the subjects of discourse on the way to Emmaus, definite teaching as to the resurrection on the third day (*v.* 46); and the preaching of repentance and forgiveness of sins for all the nations (*v.* 47); and the testimony of the Apostles (*v.* 48).

With this complement to the summary of the Gospel, partly elicited, partly taught by Christ Himself, we have in this passage all the elements of a primitive gospel, and of the literary form of a gospel, as afterwards preached in the three Synoptic Gospels; and in the Apostolical addresses on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 22–36), and at the house of Cornelius (Acts x. 34–43) by St. Peter; and at Antioch in Pisidia (Acts xiii. 23–41), and other places, by St. Paul.

It is not difficult to illustrate this correspondence. Both the scene and the fact of the Gospel narrative of the Incarnation and infancy in the Synoptics are involved in "Jesus of Nazareth" (*v.* 19). "A Prophet mighty in deed and word before God, and all the people" (*v.* 19), summarizes the life-work and the miracles, the parables and discourses of Jesus, as expanded in the detailed account of the Gospels. The large space which the record of the Passion, the atoning Death and the Resurrection of Jesus occupies both in the Synoptics and in St. John's Gospel, is anticipated by the proportion here assigned to these momentous subjects (*vv.* 19–24). The correspondence between the life and passion of Jesus Christ and the prophetical Scriptures, indicated by the phrase, "behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things and to enter into His glory?" (*v.* 26) is a clear note in the Gospel according to St. Matthew, and in several important passages of St. John (see e.g. i. 45, 51, v. 39, vii. 42, xix. 24, 28).

The same material points come out in the gospel as delivered by St. Peter on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 22–36). 1. Jesus gave proof by miracles that He was the Messiah (*v.* 22). 2. He was put to death upon the cross (*v.* 23). 3. He was raised from the dead—the essential fact of Apostolic testimony. 4. This was foretold by the prophet David (*vv.* 25, 26).

The gospel delivered by St. Paul at Antioch, in Pisidia, is mainly a gospel of the Passion and Resurrection of Christ, and of remission of sins as a consequence, all shown to be in accordance with the words of ancient prophecy.

In Acts xvii. 3, there is an instructive, though very short analysis of an oral gospel, almost in Christ's own words: "Opening and alleging, that it behoved the Christ to suffer, and to rise again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom, said he, I proclaim unto you, is the Christ." Compare with this Romans i. 3–5, and 1 Corinthians xv. 3, 4.

We see here that what may be termed the gospel literature is marked by common characteristics of form and subject. Broadly speaking the same subjects are treated, and they are treated in the same way. No one of the inspired writers departs from the prescribed type. But the type is unique. There is no other literature in the world like the literature of the Gospels. As Dr. Sanday notes,[1] it stands out distinct from all contemporary writings. Succeeding ages have experienced and attested the force and attractiveness of the gospel narrative in its unique and primitive form. And the narrative of St. Luke leads us to infer that this wonderful and divine impress, and the secret of the power of the Gospel both in the mode of its deliverance, and in its subject, are to be ascribed to the immediate guidance and direction of Jesus Christ Himself.

If this be so, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the

[1] Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible, sub voc.* Jesus Christ.

special revelation of the form of the gospel narrative should be imparted to one whose literary power and intelligence would be such as to enable him to grasp, and turn to good account, the Master's teaching. In other words, is there not an *a priori* probability that the companion of Cleopas on the way to Emmaus was St. Luke himself?

This would not indeed be admitted generally by modern theologians. Dean Farrar, for instance, writes, "There is no shadow of probability that it was St. Luke himself." Alford mentions various conjectures, as Nathanael (Epiphanius), Simon (Origen), Luke (Theophylact), but regards these conjectures as worthless. Dr. Plummer agrees with this verdict, and gives reasons for dismissing the hypothesis of St. Luke's presence.

These reasons will be kept in view in the following endeavour to establish the probability that "the other disciple" was St. Luke, and that to him first was committed the precious gift of the Gospel from the lips of Christ Himself.

All that is known for certain is that Cleopas, or Cleopatros, was one of the two disciples to whom the revelation was made. It is, of course, possible that St. Luke derives the account from this disciple whose name is given.

But there are two considerations which weigh against this. First, that the name is given.[1] Anonymity is so marked a feature of the Synoptic records that one would hesitate to assign any gospel, or fragment of a gospel, to any one as author, whose name was mentioned in the writing. Indeed the fact that the "other disciple" is unnamed makes it probable that he was the author of this record.

The other consideration which weighs against the author-

[1] The Gospel according to St. John, which is outside the Synoptic cycle, can hardly be called an exception to this rule. In chap. i. 40, the rule is observed; and in other passages where St. John notifies his presence, not by name, but by description, he does so because his testimony is expressly needed. See chaps. xiii. 23, xix. 26, xx. 2, xxi. 7, 20.

ship of Cleopas, is, that if the narrative came from him, especially if it was a written document, the whole passage would bear marks of style differing from that of St. Luke. For it is well known to every reader of St. Luke's Gospel that "where he used the materials he derived from others, whether oral or written, or both, his style reflects the Hebrew idiom of them; but when he comes to describe scenes of which he was an eye-witness and describes entirely in his own words, these disappear." [1]

Another argument may be added to the same effect. If Cleopas is the informant of St. Luke, is it conceivable that he would have allowed his own name to appear, while that of his friend and companion was passed over in silence? Such a course would have been quite opposed to the evangelical precedents of this age. A precisely opposite course is adopted by St. John (chap. i. 40) where St. Andrew is mentioned by name, while his unnamed companion is understood to be the evangelist.

If then we are to assign the source of this passage to the unnamed and unknown companion of Cleopas, the argument from style would tell against any other authorship except that of St. Luke; for the story is told with a clearness and simplicity of style, and in that pure Greek diction, which are characteristic of St. Luke.

The style of the fragment is indeed so peculiarly Lucan, that in any case the theory of a written document used by St. Luke and embedded in his narrative must be abandoned. If the passage be not the immediate testimony of St. Luke writing as an eye-witness present at the momentous scene, the source must have been oral tradition transmuted into the language of St. Luke.

[1] Archbishop Thomson in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. ii. 156. A mention of a name tends to preclude the idea of authorship. This is also the argument of Theophylact, whose words are: "Some say that one of these two disciples was Luke himself, and that therefore the Evangelist conceals his own name."

But by far the most likely supposition is that St. Luke himself received the message of divine teaching and transcribed it in his own special style and diction. Besides the general characteristics of style the vocabulary of the passage points unmistakably to original Lucan authorship. The following words occurring in this short piece are used by St. Luke alone in the New Testament: *ὁμιλεῖν, παραβιάζεσθαι, κέκλικεν, κλάσις, κατακλιθῆναι, πτοεῖσθαι, συναθροίζειν* (or *ἀθροίζειν· ἅπαξ λεγ.*), *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις.* (Such simple colloquial expressions as the last are perhaps more conclusive than single words.) The following are almost, but not quite confined to St. Luke: *διανοίγειν, συζητεῖν, ἔδει, λυτροῦσθαι, ἐξίσταναι, ὀπτασία, συμβαίνειν, παροικεῖν, διερμηνεύειν.* The form *Ἱερουσαλήμ*, frequent in Luke and Acts, occurs in two passages only of the other Gospels—Matthew xxiii. 37, and Mark xi. 11; where, however, the other form *Ἱεροσόλυμα* is also read. There are a few *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*, as *ἄφαντος, ἀντιβάλλειν προσποιεῖσθαι.*

The arguments for the presence of Luke on this occasion would of course fall to the ground if it could be proved that this Evangelist could not have been in Palestine at the time, and that he was not in fact converted until long afterwards, and that by St. Paul. But neither of these propositions can be proved.

Nothing that is recorded of St. Luke makes a temporary residence in Palestine improbable. Even if little credit can be placed in the ancient tradition that he was one of the seventy disciples (Luke x. 1), the existence of the tradition is enough to dispel any inherent improbability in the belief.[1] Professor Ramsay[2] has shown the ease and frequency of travel at this date, and it is almost certain that an earnest

[1] The Gospel in the Anglican liturgy for St. Luke's Day, which dates from the Sarum Missal, is from Luke x. 1–7 (The Mission of the Seventy Disciples). In the Greek Church the Gospel is Luke x. 16–21 (The Return of the Seventy).

[2] Expositor, December 1903.

proselyte, as St. Luke must have been, would have paid a visit to the Mother City of the nation to whose religion he had become a convert. That the topography of Jerusalem was familiar to him seems clear from incidental allusions in the Acts. It is true that in the Preface to his Gospel St. Luke admits his debt to "the eye-witnesses and ministers of the word," and professes to give the result of accurate and original research (*παρηκολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς*). This does not however exclude the possibility of his presence on some occasions in our Lord's ministry, or of his conversion by Christ Himself.

For there is no evidence that St. Luke was converted by St. Paul. If the reading in Acts xi. 28, supported by D and Augustine, De Serm. Dom. ii. 17 "when *we* were gathered together," be adopted, St. Luke was already a Christian when St. Paul met him. And it is at least probable that, if the "beloved physician" owed his conversion to St. Paul, it would have been indicated in some way in the Acts or the Epistles, as the conversion of Timothy is described in the Acts (chap. xvi. 1), and as Timothy and Titus are each addressed as "My own son in the faith" or "after the common faith" (1 Tim. i. 2, Titus i. 4).

With these considerations before us we contend that it is at least not an unlikely hypothesis that St. Luke became a proselyte in Antioch or elsewhere, while Jesus was still exercising His ministry in Palestine. If so, as the proselyte from Ethiopia (Acts viii. 27 foll.), and Nicolas, a proselyte from his own city (Acts vi. 5), and possibly a friend and fellow-convert, and many others, as we learn from Acts ii. 10, St. Luke may have travelled to Jerusalem, and there, like the Greeks in the temple courts,[1] have been brought into the presence of Jesus and become a disciple.

Further than this it is not perhaps possible to advance the argument. But it may be interesting to note that

[1] John xii. 20 foll.

Theophylact, who seems to be the earliest known commentator to identify St. Luke with the companion of Cleopas, mainly follows Chrysostom in his writings.[1] It is therefore not impossible that he is repeating a tradition of Antioch, a city closely connected with the earlier life of St. Chrysostom.

Another point of interest arises in the same connexion. The name Cleopas is a shortened form of Cleopatros, as Antipas of Antipatros, and is therefore Greek. Is it not possible that he too was a proselyte, and perhaps a friend and fellow-citizen of St. Luke, and that this link had drawn them together in a companionship destined to be so fruitful in result?

Although it is not pretended that a certain conclusion can be reached on this interesting problem, the foregoing arguments and suggestions make it at least possible to contemplate the Christ preaching His own gospel to Jew and Gentile, if not to two Gentile hearers; and if so, these disciples may be viewed as the first scribes fully "instructed unto the kingdom of heaven," and the firstfruits, one or both, of Christianity from the Gentile world.

[1] Theophylact was a citizen, and probably a native, of Constantinople. His work on St. Luke's Gospel is described in the title as an Epitome of the Commentaries of Chrysostom (*ἐπιτομὴ τῶν τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου ἐξηγητικῶν*) on the Gospel according to St. Luke. His statement therefore that some identified the companion of Cleopas with St. Luke may have had the authority of St. Chrysostom himself.

ARTHUR CARR.

ON THE "ARISTOCRATIC" CHARACTER OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

MODERN views of the Old Testament involve a reconstruction of our ideas in many directions. Thus so long as we regarded the Hebrew Scriptures as a direct gift to the Chosen People from that God who is no "respecter of persons," it was natural for us to consider them as concerned equally with the king on the throne and the beggar on the dunghill. Protestant individualism pointed in the same direction. All souls are equally precious in the sight of God, and the Bible could not be the book of a class.

But now that we have learned to look on the Old Testament as the revised version of the literature of an ancient state we are naturally faced by the reflection that the states of antiquity were essentially "aristocratic"; the class that *counted* was a comparatively small one. Was this the case in Israel? Is there evidence of the fact in the Old Testament? Does this consideration throw any light on Scripture or Scripture History?

Let us look from this point of view at the earliest group of writing prophets, Hosea, Amos and Micah. It has often been noticed, and indeed is obvious, that they condemn the sins of the rich. Refined sensuality, judicial corruption, and land-stealing are impossible vices for the lower classes. I think we may legitimately go further. The men who in Amos (ii. 8, v. 12) have control both of the temples and the law courts are apparently the same as the nobles who banquet with the king in Hosea (vii. 5) and the men who enclose the commonage in Micah (ii. 2). They are a privileged class. This is of the utmost importance, because it is *their* vices that are bringing Yahweh's wrath on Israel. The nobility is the only class that counts; the great bulk of the people are not responsible for the coming judgment and

yet are powerless to avert it. The prophets' view of Israel is thoroughly "aristocratic."

This consideration throws light on the moral condition of Israel, or rather it makes darkness visible. It is commonly assumed that the prophets supply us with irrefutable evidence that both Samaria and Jerusalem came to their end in a state of appalling corruption. But if the prophets are writing of the aristocracy, their accusations are no more illustrative of the state of Israel as a whole than—*magnis componere parva*—the attacks of "Rita" on the "Smart Set" are an indictment of the people of England.

And further. Even against the nobles themselves the prophets' statements carry but little weight, since the vices condemned are those *characteristic* of an aristocracy and more or less in evidence in every country and every age. We do not know what allowance the prophets were prepared to make for human frailty, and therefore we cannot on their evidence condemn the nobles of Israel as outrageous sinners. How would the contemporary Greeks and Italians have fared at the prophets' hands? Or the mediæval Barons? Or the members of the modern European Peerages? We have no direct means of knowing how any of these classes would have compared with the aristocracy of Israel. The whole question of the moral condition of Israel requires to be considered afresh.

As another illustration of the matter in hand, let us turn to the Law. Take the Deuteronomic statute of "Release." "Thoroughly unpractical," say the critics, as they do of so much of the Deuteronomic legislation. I confess I always begin the study of Deuteronomy from the opposite side; I assume that the law is thoroughly practical, having been carefully considered and discussed in that Upper Chamber at the gate of the Temple Court. On this hypothesis I try to restore a state of society to which the law would be

applicable. The law in this case orders that every seventh year all loans are to be cancelled. As between neighbours and equals this would be unpractical—and, indeed, something more. If X and Y are two men of the same class, who alternately lend each other a plough, or a guinea, or a jar of oil, as occasion requires, and the law orders that every seventh year the outstanding loan is to be cancelled, it would be not only "unpractical" but absolutely silly. But if all the lending is on one side, and all the borrowing on the other, the case is altered. Let us imagine that a chief lives amongst his clan. They are his dependents, and follow him in war; he is their earthly providence, for he is the only rich man among them. In time of drought he must lend them food and seed-corn for next season; in time of rinderpest he must lend them cattle to plough; a man who wishes to marry may have to borrow from the chief the present for the bride's parents; and so on. The chief is under no legal obligation to lend, but there is a strong moral force compelling him, and if the people starve, or are wretched, he suffers in his prestige and character with the other chiefs. The temptation to such a chief is rather to lend too much than too little, to involve his people in such a hopeless network of debt that they become his slaves, and can call neither their cottages nor their families their own. It is against this that the statute is aimed. Every seven years patron and client are to start with a clean sheet. The admonition not to be niggardly because the year of release is at hand, would certainly be unpractical in a case between equals; but where the chief has some obligation to lend, and the retainer some claim to borrow, the matter is wholly different. The Deuteronomic legislation is an "aristocratic" law.

As a third and last example of the value of this line of thought consider the question of the Exile and the Return.

It used to be supposed (and the Bible to some extent countenances the idea) that almost all the people were carried captive to Babylon, and that the land was practically deserted until the Return. It is now more correctly believed that only a comparatively small fraction of the inhabitants were deported. On this fact a number of somewhat extravagant theories have been based by well known writers. If (say they) at least four-fifths of the people remained in the land, then surely *they* rebuilt the Temple, supplied the restored prophecy, organized the restored Jerusalem. The Return, if indeed it can properly be said to have taken place at all, dwindles and dwindles in the hands of the critics until we are left with the solitary fact that a century and a half after the capture of Jerusalem the Persian governor was a man of Jewish descent.

These views will not, I believe, prove tenable. The Return will be regarded again as an important factor in Israel's history. The difficulty will be largely removed if we consider the aristocratic nature of Israel. It was the nobles that were deported, and they were the only class that counted. Without them any sort of *national* existence was impossible. It was the return of the nobility that was the signal for the restoration of prophecy (even if Haggai and Zechariah did not themselves come from Babylon) and for the rebuilding of the Temple. The stories in Ezra and Nehemiah will be found to be highly probable in themselves if we regard them as written by aristocrats about aristocrats.

J. C. Todd.

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE STUDY OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT.

THE following remarks are not offered as anything like a comprehensive exposition of the subject of New Testament study. They do not, for instance, refer to devotional study, theology, or the Old Testament preparation for Christianity. They are simply some thoughts which have passed through my mind in taking up public work on the New Testament, after spending a number of years mainly in classical study and teaching.

St. Paul writes: "An unspiritual man rejects the things of the Spirit of God: to him they are mere folly; he cannot understand them, because they can only be spiritually inquired into. But he that is spiritual is able to investigate all things." These words give rise to my first thought, that the New Testament cannot be adequately interpreted by any one who is not of Christ's fold. Those who are disposed to cavil at such a statement will probably agree with it when asked to think of some analogous cases. Can a symphony of Beethoven be in any degree appreciated by the man who has no music in his soul? What of the appreciation of literature not contained in the New Testament? There are some English poets, for example, whose study is a mental agony to some, and an unspeakable pleasure to others. There is no responsive chord in the natures of the former persons. It may be taken as axiomatic that in the study of literature, as in the intercourse of ordinary life, a certain sympathy, spontaneous or acquired, must exist, before a proper understanding of a work can be attained. This is true of the New Testament even as literature. It was left for a layman to show how great a historian Luke really is, after some theological

writers had rated him lower than his proper value.[1] And if this be true of the New Testament as literature, much more is it true of it as Christian literature, the sole occasion of which was the propagation of Christ's gospel among men. The interpreter of the New Testament must, to begin with, have the spirit of Christ; and only in so far as he is filled thereby, will his expositions be of enduring value.

But he must be more. And here the Apostle again comes to my aid. He who wrote the words just read, also said: "Prove all things: hold fast that which is good." This warning advice has a great value in the exposition of the New Testament. There is need for the greatest employment of knowledge and skill in its study. The most highly trained specialists in every department, which is in any way connected with the study, must be accessible to the student. Hardly any of these departments has been thoroughly worked out in our time, partly because there is no finality in such matters, but partly because some expositors, through lack of proper training, have imagined that they understood the environment of the New Testament writers and incidents, and made rashly dogmatic statements about this, that and the other thing. These statements were evolved from their own consciousness, or derived from antiquated authorities, which had rested on their book-shelves since boyhood. This is not the way to expound the New Testament, and, in order to understand what this literature means, we must acquire as minute a knowledge of, and as real a sympathy with, human life in the first century of our era as is possible to us. Platitudes derived from Juvenal and his contemporaries present at best a one-sided view, apart from the question of date. We want to have a comprehensive knowledge of how men

[1] Prof. W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller, etc.*, chap. i., and *Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?* chaps. i. and ii. (Hodder & Stoughton).

lived in the first century A.D. in the various parts of the Roman Empire referred to in the New Testament. We must pay special attention to the life of three classes, the natives, the Roman citizens, and the Jews. By life I mean, of course, life in the widest sense, and this includes private life, institutions like law and religion, education, embracing philosophy and rhetoric, and language.

The classification is a rough one, but may serve to show what we ought to study, if we are to understand aright the bearing of the new truths on the people who first listened to them. I speak more or less as an outsider, but have the impression that the study of the life in Palestine in the time of our Lord, except in systematic excavation of sites, has been more cultivated than that of life in Asia Minor and Greece in the time of the Apostles, though doubtless there is room for more clearness in the presentation of the exact place of the Romans in the country, and the exact place of Greek in the speech of the inhabitants. But it is still more important for us, Gentiles as most of us are, to realize as fully as possible the life of the people in those cities which were visited by the God-appointed Apostle of the Gentiles. The Epistles are more suited to the educated Western scholar than the Gospels. It could hardly be otherwise. The classical education of the West is, with some differences, not unlike the education which Paul must have received at Tarsus. His thoughts are inevitably cast in a language which is understood of the educated but not of the simple-minded. I do not know if we always realize that Paul bears a special relation to us that no other Apostle does. The cry of back to the Jesus of the Gospels may be a kind of insult to that very Jesus. If we believe that Paul was appointed to preach the gospel to the Gentiles, and trust in God's wisdom, we are bound as Gentiles to receive the words of Paul as the very words of God Himself, except where he explicitly tells us that he is

speaking as a mere human being. The discourses of Jesus were divinely appropriate to the audience which listened to them. Such is also the case with the words of Paul. However much we may Hebraize ourselves, if we have studied ancient literature and philosophy, Paul is our Apostle, and no other can take his place. Whether there are contradictions between the teaching of Paul, as we call it, and the teaching of Jesus, while an interesting enough question to the philosopher, is of no practical importance. The words of our Apostle are to be received as the rule of conduct for Gentiles. Having, then, explained what I feel with regard to the Pauline teaching, I may go on to refer to the study of the surrounding life, amidst which the Epistles were written and read.

The private life of the ancient cities of Greece and Asia Minor is rather elusive in its character. The literature of the period deals but little with it. We may draw certain inferences from earlier and later authors, but these must be used with caution. The inscriptions and the papyri are the fruitful store from which one can draw. They must always be studied, however, according to date and locality, and one would do well to follow the methods employed by such scholars as Mommsen in examining and using the evidence provided by them. As a general working rule, it may be said that one or two instances of any fact in them prove nothing, but that rules may be drawn from a large collection. The student must not be satisfied with modern text-books. He must constantly go back to the original documents. He must also keep pace with as much of the periodical literature as he can. Most journals give an epitomized account of the contents of kindred journals. These should be scanned, and the necessary articles should be noted and afterwards read. It may be taken that, with few exceptions, English, French and German papers give an account of all important research in this, as in all other

parts of our subject. The value of the knowledge that may be acquired, in estimating the character of ancient life in Asia Minor, can be best seen in Professor Ramsay's various works, particularly his *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*. It ought to be a point of honour with Western Christians to have all sites visited by St. Paul scientifically excavated, and the results carefully published. It is disgraceful that such work should have been left almost entirely to private enterprise. Far be it from me to say a word against the spending of money on missionary or philanthropic enterprise. But Christianity is not confined to these. There is an intellectual hunger that cries for satisfaction. May we still hope that in our lifetime the British Government may be got to take some interest in this matter, and, in seeking material benefits for all, not neglect the study of Christian history, as it has the higher musical education of the people? The gain to New Testament study would be incalculable.

A knowledge of the worships of Greece and Asia Minor is also necessary, and in this sphere of study we are in a very much better position than our predecessors. To them the ancient gods were little more than a catalogue of names. Now, the application of the historical method to the study of ancient religions has shown how much the religion of the Jews had in common with those of all the surrounding countries. We can by this knowledge understand all the better wherein lie the essential differences between the pagan cults and Judaism or Christianity. The subject is a very large one, but also a very fascinating one. The best introduction to it is an article, as yet unpublished, but shortly to appear in the extra volume of Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*. This is from the pen of Ramsay, and is entitled *Religion of Greece and Asia Minor*. The dry bones of the subject, if one can use such an expression of this study, can be found in Roscher's *Lexikon der Mythologie*,

the best English presentation of it in Mr. Farnell's *Cults of the Greek States*, both works being still unfinished. If we seek for an example of the advantage of such study, we shall find it in the problem about food offered to idols. This is a confessedly difficult subject, but it has recently received illumination from documents connected with religion.[1]

As to philosophy, it is to be feared that we have thought rather more of those Greek philosophers who are important for ourselves as thinking persons, than of those who lived in the period between Aristotle and Paul, the writers whose books Paul must have read and been acquainted with. Of this it would be unfair to complain. It is generally allowed by those best able to judge that the philosophers of the intervening period, such men as Philodemus the Epicurean, for example, are barren and uninteresting. We must remember, however, that Cicero derived from the philosophers of that age the ground-work of his delightful philosophical writings, which have undoubtedly had a great and good influence on the European thought of later times. There must have been much in the works of those writers, now mostly lost, which was really useful, and adapted to the intellectual grasp of their age, and it is the duty of the expositor of Paul to read and study their existing remains, if only to realize the sort of teaching which Paul must have received for the Greek part of his education. Paul himself must have been classed by the Greeks as an itinerant philosopher or rhetorician, and used the methods common to such. We have a parallel to him in the later Dio Chrysostom, whose orations have been most unworthily neglected.

But, for the study of the Pauline Epistles, a comprehensive knowledge of Greek philosophy is desirable. One of the characteristics of the philosophy of St. Paul's day was eclecticism. Each school borrowed doctrines from the others

[1] Cf. Moulton in Expositor, 1901, i. p. 279, 1903, ii. p. 432; Ramsay in Expositor, 1900, ii. p. 429, 1901, i. p. 93 ff.

to such an extent that it was hard to distinguish the schools by anything but their names. A good instance of this is Seneca, who, though a Stoic by classification, quotes statements of Epicureans and others, and stamps them with as high approval as he gives to those of the leaders of his own school. This fact makes a knowledge of all the ancient philosophical systems, and the ancient books and fragments of books expounding them, a desirable possession. But there can be no doubt that special attention should be devoted to the Stoic doctrines, as with these St. Paul must have been specially brought into contact. This has been shown at length by scholars like Bishop Lightfoot, who has accumulated most wonderful parallels between St. Paul and Seneca. But there is an especial reason for the study in the fact that Athenodorus, one of the later Stoics, was a prominent citizen and teacher of Tarsus, the birthplace of the Apostle. We are fortunate in now having a volume of fragments of the Stoic writers, edited by Von Arnim, to be followed by two others, which will together contain everything of the kind which antiquity has left us. Here also the rule, that one must study most closely what is most nearly contemporaneous with the Apostle, must be adhered to. As an introduction, that by Dr. E. L. Hicks, entitled *St. Paul and Hellenism*, and contained in the fourth volume of *Studia Biblica*, or Dr. Paul Wendland's *Christentum und Hellenismus*,[1] can be highly recommended.

The other important branch of ancient education was the study of rhetoric. It is somewhat difficult for us to realize how higher education among the ancients was directed almost solely to the making of efficient and telling public speakers in the assembly or the law court. The elaborate rules for the construction of speeches may seem to us highly

[1] Leipzig, 1901. Dr. Wendland, the editor of the *Letter of Aristeas*, and the co-editor of Philo, is one of the greatest living authorities on post-classical Greek.

artificial, but there can be no question that the ancients had earned by their experience the right to dictate on such a matter as no modern people has earned it. The pupil had to study long the best ways of influencing and persuading his fellow-men to a course of action. His task was not merely what to say, but just as much how and when to say it. The value of such training was very great. It could convert a very commonplace person into a considerable power, though of course its highest results could not be obtained without the burning spirit behind, whose enthusiasm would from time to time carry the orator above and beyond the technical rules. Such rules do not stifle individuality, but prune it of its ugly excrescences. And this training affected not merely speeches, but all composition, even in verse. The ancient authors, especially perhaps at this time, wrote everything in such a way as would tell best if it were declaimed. It is so with the greatest poem of the day, Lucan's *Civil War*,[1] and it is so also with the Pauline Epistles. It is obvious that they must have been composed greatly with a view to the effect which they might have when read aloud to the congregations to which they were sent. We lose much in their case, as we do in the case of other ancient writings, when we do not have them declaimed for us, and do not use our ears rather than our eyes. Let us then study the rules of ancient rhetoric in some such book as Volkmann's, and trace how far they are obeyed in New Testament compositions. Dr. Blass, a teacher whose opinion on such subjects all must respect, tells us that the Epistle to the Hebrews shows in the building up of the clauses and the style the care and taste of an artistic writer.[2] In this connexion, I ought to refer to the epistolary modes of expression in Paul's letters, which Deissmann and Rendel Harris[3]

[1] Commonly, but incorrectly, called *Pharsalia*.

[2] *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (2. Aufl. 1902), Sachregister, *s.v.* Hebräerbrief, cf. Prof. J. H. Moulton, Expositor, 1904, i. p. 71.

[3] Expositor.

have shown to be those usual at the time, as seen in the letters preserved in recently discovered papyri. The Dean of Westminster has devoted an excursus to this subject in his most valuable commentary on *Ephesians*.

At this point a reference to law may not be out of place. While the Mosaic law is most commonly referred to, a certain knowledge of other ancient legal ideas and systems is most useful. And what we have to study is not so much the Roman law as known and practised in Italy, but the systems in vogue in the Eastern part of the Empire. We must try to understand those set up by the successors of Alexander the Great, themselves superimposed on others previously existing. Little information on those of Asia Minor has come down to us, but we may expect to have it considerably added to by the discovery of more inscriptions. Meantime, Mitteis' *Reichsrecht und Volksrecht* is the standard work in this neglected department of study, and the Egyptian papyri contain much to help us towards a knowledge of the working of law in Egypt, and to provide analogies for the understanding of other systems. Some older expositors, who had only a vague notion of ancient administration, seem to have thought that the Roman Empire was governed over all its parts by exactly the same laws. It may not be even untrue to suppose that they were ignorant of the fact that Greek was the official language of the Eastern half of the Empire. If they were aware of this and what it implied, it showed a lamentable ignorance of the facts of life to suppose that the laws could be the same, when the language was different. The Romans had little or nothing to learn about administration. They kept the systems they found in all the provinces, except where they were such as might lead to the dismemberment of the Empire. States were governed by client-kings under Rome's suzerainty, until they were fit to be fully incorporated in the Empire. So was

it with the religions of these countries. They were all suffered to continue, but the provinces were bound together by the higher worship of Rome and the reigning emperor. It may be interesting, therefore, to quote the Latin law books in illustration of the New Testament; but as many of the laws have reference to Italy, they must be used with caution.

Such is part of the equipment which helps the student to be in the proper condition of mind to approach the writings of the New Testament with a view to their thorough comprehension, and it now remains to say something about the way in which the study itself ought to be carried on.

It is almost a commonplace to say that each book or group of books should be read by itself in the first instance, all the attention being concentrated on it alone. Regard must also be had to the chronological order. The student should first pin his faith to some chronological order that has received wide acceptance at the present time, such as Harnack's, and take the books in this order, not, however, wandering from a writer till he has completed the study of his works. One ought to read each book aloud, or, better still, have it read aloud, with as much expression as possible and repeatedly, till the whole context is vivid and present to the mind. This cannot be too much insisted on, in view of the almost invariable custom among the ancients of listening to works read aloud by the ἀναγνώστης or *lector*, rather than reading them silently with the eyes only. Another good reason for this practice is that the ear has a better memory than the eye. Due attention must also be paid to the paragraphs, not the least of the services which Westcott and Hort have done for the text of the New Testament. Their value has been recognized by Nestle, who has repeated them in his own text. It may frequently be found advisable to re-read a paragraph before going on to what follows.

When the work has thus been read frequently, there doubtless remain a number of difficulties, both of text and interpretation, and with regard to the solution of these something must be said. First with regard to the text. The student naturally desires to read that text which approximates most nearly to the original autographs. But what is that text? Most persons in this country would say "Westcott and Hort's." To the truth of this I would not demur, if "independent text" be meant. For the student, however, either the *Textus Receptus* with Dr. Sanday's appendices,[1] or Nestle's Stuttgart New Testament[2] would probably prove more useful. Many believe that Hort dismissed the Western Text too curtly, and certainly one of the wants of the age is a proper edition of this early and important text, in which Beza's great codex will find its proper place. Great things are expected of the text of Von Soden, which is shortly to appear.[3] The advantage of the two editions recommended is that, if the text given do not suit his judgment, perhaps something in the *apparatus* will commend itself to him. Even the oldest and best manuscripts have errors at times, and may be corrected from later and inferior ones. The student, however, should always make a serious attempt to understand the text before him. It is possible that it was produced by a better scholar than he himself is; and here the use of lexicon, grammar, translations and commentaries comes in.

As to the lexicons, the careful and minute works of Grimm-Thayer and Cremer must still be used, but with caution, and alongside of the *Lexicon Graecum Suppletorium et Dialecticum* of Van Herwerden (Leyden, 1902), Deissmann's *Bible Studies*, Canon Hicks' articles in the

[1] Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1889.

[2] Fourth edition, 1903.

[3] *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte*, Band i. Teil 1 (pp. xvi. + 704, Berlin: Duncker, 1902).

Classical Review for 1887, Professor Ramsay's articles entitled *The Greek of the Early Church and the Pagan Ritual* in the *Expository Times* for October 1898, and later, Mr. Moulton's recent papers in the EXPOSITOR on the language of the papyri,[1] and, generally, all recent editions of later Greek works and documents with verbal indexes. When Crönert's new Greek dictionary appears, it is hoped that the results of such scattered articles will be combined in one work. His papers in the *Classical Review*, though they have incurred some adverse criticism, promise well. Illustrations of the Greek we find in the New Testament are daily accumulating, and personal study of papyri and inscriptions is a most useful adjunct to the papers here mentioned. The Septuagint also should be by the student's side, with the splendid concordance of Hatch and Redpath, for which we are indebted to the Clarendon Press.[2]

For the grammatical difficulties the reader must consult Winer-Moulton,[3] Winer-Schmiedel, which is still far from complete, and Blass's second edition. He ought also to have by him the splendid *Historical Greek Grammar* of Jannaris, which covers the whole of Greek from the beginning of Attic Greek to the present day. A training in classical Greek is a great advantage for the study of the Greek New Testament. By it we learn to respect minute differences of expression, and obtain a knowledge of their respective value. But we must not allow this knowledge to bias us in the interpretation of the language of the New Testament. It is only the spirit attained by the acquisition of such knowledge that must be applied to the language of the New Testament. We must collect,

[1] 1901, i. 271 ff., 1903, i. 104 ff., ii. 423 ff., also his *Classical Review* articles there referred to.

[2] We are promised a Grammar to the LXX from the capable hands of Mr. H. St. John Thackeray.

[3] Of which a new edition is being prepared by Dr. Moulton's son, Prof. J. H. Moulton.

examine, and arrange here as elsewhere. A much needed caution must be exercised. There is no homogeneity except that of spirit and speech between, say, the Gospel of St. Matthew and an Epistle of St. Paul. We must take each writer's grammar by itself. Such excellent aids as Bruder's and Moulton and Geden's concordances make this kind of study easy.

As to the help which translations can give, the best translation to use is perhaps still, as in Dr. Routh's day, the Vulgate. We may be able to improve on it at times, but its renderings are always entitled to respect. In English, the *Twentieth Century Translation*, and Dr. Weymouth's, are perhaps the best in existence of the whole New Testament. Both are the result of great labour, and show good taste.

Of commentaries the number is legion, and it is difficult to give good advice with regard to them. The use of the commentary ought to be the last stage in the study of the New Testament, and it should be consulted only in cases where difficulty has occurred. When I say this, I presuppose thorough study of the text. Those who are not prepared to study the text seriously, would be better to follow a good commentary blindly from the first. I should strongly advise study of the ancient Greek and Latin commentaries, which has been rather neglected of late years. The texts are often inaccurate or badly printed, but this state of matters will be gradually remedied. I would seek to reinforce Mr. C. H. Turner's recent appeal to the English Universities to undertake the editing of the exegetical writings of the Fathers on the New Testament.[1] It is work for which the best trained theological students at our Universities are eminently fitted, and I venture to think that some of them would be better employed thus than in writing commentaries of their own. It is not always

[1] *Journal of Theological Studies*, iv. (1902), pp. 139, 140.

sufficiently realized how great an advantage the Greeks and Latins have *a priori* over ourselves in the interpretation of the New Testament. It ought to be recalled that they lived amidst surroundings, climate, intellectual atmosphere, and language very much more like that of New Testament times than we do. We ought to pay more respect to their opinions than we have done. The marvellous acquaintance with Scripture which some of them reveal is in itself an education to the modern Christian scholar, on whose cheek it might well produce a blush of shame. But it is quite true that the modern commentator is often superior in historical imagination and critical knowledge of the language, and he cannot be neglected. Much valuable help can be got from the *International Critical Commentary* and the *Expositor's Greek Testament*, both now in course of publication.[1] There is no finality in commentaries, but each, if faithfully written, contains something that is valuable for all time. Of this truth, Wettstein, Bengel, and some of the *Critici Sacri* are good examples.

[1] The third volume of the latter, taking us down to *Colossians*, has recently appeared.

ALEX. SOUTER.

ADAM AND CHRIST IN ST. PAUL.

It is not my intention in this paper to write a reply to Professor Peake. Nothing I ever read made a deeper impression on my mind than the last paragraph of Jowett's essay on *Atonement and Satisfaction*. I venture to quote a sentence or two to indicate the kind of impression I mean. "If our Saviour were to come again to earth, which of all the theories of atonement and sacrifice would He sanction with His authority? Perhaps none of them, yet perhaps all may be consistent with a true service of Him. The question has no answer. But it suggests the thought that we shrink from bringing controversy into His presence." It is not, I hope, in the temper of controversy at all that I shall try to state, as clearly as possible, with reference to Professor Peake's article, the place which ought to be taken in a representation of St. Paul's thoughts by the conceptions of a racial act, and of a mystical union.

Professor Peake holds that the interpretation of St. Paul depends upon a due appreciation and use of these ideas. The conception of a racial act he finds in Romans v. 12–21, and although he is not astonished that I pass by this passage in *The Death of Christ*, it is perhaps not an unfair inference that he would have been astonished at almost any one else who did so. Yet my reason for passing it by is obvious; it does not mention the death of Christ. Not indeed that I should deny any reference in it to that subject; on the contrary, I agree with Meyer that "the obedience of the one" by which "the many shall be justified" is specifically the obedience rendered by Christ in His death. But this conception of obedience is one to which I did full justice elsewhere, and apart from it there was (as it seemed to me) no specific interpretation of Christ's death in the passage which called for consideration. Further,

there was the fact, which I will express in Professor Peake's words, of "the incompatibility of his (Paul's) statements with history as we understand it." One may argue, of course, with Professor Peake, that this is of no consequence, since Paul's interest was not historical but psychological. That is exactly what I should do, but I should feel that, in consequence of so doing, the conception of a "racial act" was one with which I could no longer operate seriously even in the interpretation of St. Paul. For the psychological truth is one which belongs to my personal experience, whereas the "racial act" is surely one to which independent historical reality is essential. If we put the psychological truth, which we know at first hand—say the truth that the human race is one in the consciousness of sin—into a historical form incompatible with history—say the form that the progenitor of the human race committed a sin which involved all his descendants—we are guilty of a *μετάβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος*, and the result—the conception of the "racial act" of Adam—has no validity. This is what I meant by describing a "racial act," perhaps with needless levity, but certainly without malice, as a "fantastic abstraction." [1]

A further and a serious reason for not making the passage in Romans v. 12–21 so fundamental to an exposition of Paulinism as many excellent scholars are disposed to do

[1] It may not be inappropriate to remark in passing that it is unsound as well as unwise to make Paul's testimony to Christ depend upon his idea of the inclusion of the race in Adam. *Paul knew Christ.* He knew what He had done for him, and in him, and what He was able to do for all men. He knew this at first hand in a way which is entirely independent of speculations about Adam; he preached it as he knew it, and it is the interest of the gospel to make this plain. *As for Adam, Paul did not know him at all.* Neither do we. Paul's Adam is simply the abstraction of human nature, personified and placed with a determining power at the beginning of human history. Such a figure has no reality for our minds, and I own it seems to me hopeless to seek the key to the work of Christ in the assumed "racial" action of this hypothetical entity.

is that this passage is one on which men will differ to the end of time.

This last point might be illustrated by reference to Professor Peake's own interpretation. This interpretation is dominated by the conception of the racial act, and the parallelism between Adam and Christ is worked out strictly in this sense. To what, then, does it amount? As far as I can make out, only to this: Through one man's disobedience—that is, through the racial act of Adam—every member of the human race, immediately, without any element of choice, was constituted sinful, in the sense of becoming liable to death. On the other hand, through the obedience of the one—that is, through the racial act of Christ—every member of the human race, in the same immediate way, without any element of choice, was constituted righteous, in the sense of securing resurrection from the dead. "That they—that is, all men—belong to a race judged guilty or declared righteous, that they experience physical death or resurrection, these are facts which happen without any reference to their individual will." So Professor Peake himself sums it up.

Now this may possibly be what St. Paul ought to have said. It may even be what he would have said had he held the conception of a racial act on which Professor Peake lays such stress, and had he applied it with the same consistency to the great decisive acts of Adam and of Christ. But I venture to think that few will agree with Professor Peake in holding that this is what he does say. Whether we are to call the act of Christ by which the act of Adam is reversed a racial act or not, it was an act importing infinitely more than is here brought into view. We must not, in order that we may be justified in calling it a racial act, eviscerate or curtail it till its consequences are such and only such as affect every member of the race. We must take the act and all that it imports as it is described by the Apostle,

whether we can call it racial or not. How, then, does the Apostle describe it? He says the free gift takes its start ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων: that is, it finds its motive not in the guilt of the race as impersonated in Adam, but in the multiplied offences of real men. He says that those who get the benefit of Christ's act "shall reign in life." Is the meaning of that magnificent phrase exhausted when we say that every member of the race shall be raised from the dead? He says that as sin reigned in death, even so grace shall reign through righteousness unto eternal life; the former disastrous state of affairs is related to the act of Adam, the latter to the act of Christ. In every case, what is related to the act of Christ is the complete Christian salvation; and the way to avoid universalism—which I agree with Professor Peake is not a Pauline thought—is not to clip the act of Christ till we can invest the whole race in all the credit of it without securing the salvation of one of its members, but to recognize that neither that act itself nor any consequence of it has any significance for any member of the race apart from the condition of faith.

The difficulty involved in representing the act of Christ in Rom. v. as "racial" comes out perhaps most clearly if we observe that it compels us to use the Pauline expression "in Christ" in two different senses. On the one hand, *the race is in Christ.* "In His death the race dies and atones for its sin, is pronounced righteous by God, and therefore the physical death which fell on the race as the penalty of its act in Adam is cancelled by the universal resurrection of the body." But this does not mean that anybody is saved. On the other hand, *the believer is in Christ.* He cries out of his faith, I have been crucified with Christ; and although we do not find him claim that in so doing he has, like the race, atoned for his sins, his being in Christ is his salvation. Now with the utmost respect but with perfect confidence I submit that the difference between these two

conceptions of being in Christ is that the second is in contact with reality and the first is not. The second is an experience, the first has no basis in experience at all; it is a purely artificial and abstract conception which we have no means of verifying, and which certainly does not verify itself. And as we cannot find an experimental verification for it, just as little can we find a scriptural basis. I cannot admit that we find a "racial" application of the expression "in Christ" in 1 Corinthians xv. 22. It appears to me unquestionable that the correct interpretation of this passage is that given (for example) by Professor Findlay in the *Expositor's Greek Testament*: what Paul teaches is not that all men will be raised from the dead in virtue of the fact that the race has in Christ died and made atonement for its sin, but that in every case life—which includes the whole glory revealed in 1 Corinthians xv.—depends on a connexion with Christ, just as death in every case depends on a connexion with Adam. There is no eschatology either in Romans v. 12–21, or in 1 Corinthians xv., but that of the Christian hope. The other passage to which Professor Peake refers, 2 Corinthians v. 14, is equally unconvincing. To say "one died for all, therefore all died," is quite intelligible if we suppose that the one in dying took to Himself in love by God's appointment the responsibilities represented by the death of all; but if the death of the one could be properly described as a "racial" act—that is as the act of the "all" in Him—it would not be possible to attach any clear meaning to the words which are the nerve of the New Testament—One died *for* all.

It is easier, no doubt, to conceive a "racial" act in the case of Adam—easier for the imagination, that is—assuming Adam to be a real person. When Adam sinned, he was the race; and his act implicated all who in the way of nature were to owe their being to him. They were yet in the loins of their father when he forfeited the family character and

inheritance. This is the sense in which many theologians have read Romans v. 12 ff., and in this sense Adam's act may fairly enough be called racial. But it is not on this that Professor Peake bases his view. Indeed he explicitly rejects this view. "Adam acts for us," he says, "in virtue of a community of nature with us." And again, "He acted as every individual in his place would have acted." It is thus that his act is racial. I own that from these premises I should have drawn exactly the opposite conclusion. I should have said with the Apocalypse of Baruch: *Non est ergo Adam causa, nisi animae suae tantum: nos vero unusquisque fuit animae suae Adam.* Adam, in short, is nothing real, but an abstraction for human nature. And surely it is very difficult to extend the conception of a racial act on *this* basis to the work of Christ. Did *He* act "as every individual in His place would have acted?" Can we point to Him, as we can point to Adam, and with the whole human race in our minds, say, *Ex uno disce omnes?* The question answers itself. The old humanity *was*, in a sense, in Adam; the new humanity—that which is in Christ—has first to be created in Him; and that new creation is not the condition or the presupposition of Christ's work; it is its fruit. Whenever we realize that Adam is but the abstraction of sinful human nature, personified, we see that the attempt to assimilate the relations of humanity to Adam and to Christ respectively is an attempt to prove that the old sinful race bears the same relation to its own logical shadow as the new redeemed race bears to its Redeemer. We see also how unsound it is to argue that "the interest of a merely vicarious theory is to insist on the sharp distinction between Christ and the race," while the interest of a theory operating with the conception of racial acts is "to identify them as closely as possible." Discounting the biassed "merely," it is the interest of the vicarious theory, as much as of the other, to insist on the identity. There is no

salvation, all Christians are agreed, except through union with Christ. The question at issue is where that union comes in. If the death of Christ is a racial act, it comes in antecedent to it and as a condition of its atoning efficacy. According to St. Paul and common Christian belief it comes in subsequent to it, and is the result of its atoning efficacy. I once quoted before in the EXPOSITOR, but venture to quote again, the glorious lines of St. Bernard, which put with the moral passion which alone justifies mysticism the final truth in the matter:

Propter mortem quam tulisti
Quando pro me defecisti,
Cordis mei cor dilectum
In te meum fer affectum.

Here the union with Christ comes in its true place: it is the death of Christ *for* men, which appealing to them as an irresistible motive draws them into a union closer and ever closer with Himself.

Having said so much on the first point, on which I am quite conscious of the difference between the reading of St. Paul which approves itself to Professor Peake and that which has just been given, I pass gladly to the second, on which I believe we are far more at one—I mean the idea of Christian union with Christ. It is possible to consider this without raising the question of race relations of Christ at all; for that "being in Christ" with which we are here concerned is not the state of the race but the experience of the believer.

I do not, indeed, think it helps us to understand the Christian's union to Christ to contemplate a pre-incarnate relation of Christ to men, such as Professor Peake finds in Hebrews ii. 11–17, or "a universal headship of the race," such as he finds in 1 Corinthians xi. 3. He thinks we may press the words in the last passage—"the head of every man is Christ"—in this sense. But "man" in this passage does not refer to the race

at all, but to man as opposed to woman. Paul had taught at Corinth as elsewhere that in Christ there is neither male nor female, and he found Christian women in Corinth acting on that principle in a way which he did not approve. They seemed to be carrying out the Divine life of the Gospel on lines which defied the equally Divine constitution of nature, and in vindicating this last Paul uses the peculiar analogy that woman is to man as man is to Christ and as Christ is to God. Many have agreed with his conclusion, but did anybody ever repeat his argument? To show that I had no *animus* in using an expression which Professor Peake seems to have felt unkind, I will say frankly that the Apostle himself employs here a whole series of fantastic abstractions, with the result that his argument has never weighed with any man in the world, and still less with any woman. And he was conscious himself that it would not when in verse 16 he practically threw it overboard, and appealed to the authority of universal Christian custom.

We cannot however, but agree as to the words in which Paul describes union to Christ. He speaks of a Christian as "a man in Christ." He says, "I have been crucified with Christ, and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me." He says again, "To me to live is Christ"; and "when Christ, our life, shall appear." As men in general are said to live and move and have their being in God, so from the first of his Epistles to the last Christian men, for St. Paul, live and move and have their being in Christ. To refer only to his earliest Epistles, Paul has confidence *in the Lord* toward the Thessalonians; he charges and entreats them *in the Lord Jesus Christ*; they stand *in the Lord*; he gives them commandments *through the Lord Jesus*; church rulers are those who are over them *in the Lord*; the Christians departed are *the dead in Christ*. To illustrate the place which union with Christ has in his mind would be to tran-

scribe everything he has written about the Christian life. So far it is not possible to disagree.

Probably there would be less inclination than there is to think of disagreement on this subject if all who used such terms as mystical and moral tried to make clear to themselves what they meant by them, and in particular if they considered whether they are able to give a Christian meaning to mystical when they use it simply in contrast with moral. Professor Peake himself, if I read him rightly, never makes the contrast absolute. The conception of a moral union with Christ is one which he recognizes; though it does not seem to him to cover the language of St. Paul, it has a legitimacy within limits. But when he brings into view what he calls the mystical union, he does not seem to feel the necessity of demonstrating any relation between it and the other. The whole emphasis is laid on the contrast. He speaks of "a moral union merely." He says, "I should not describe the fact that my will was in harmony with Christ's will, that I passed the same moral judgments and sought the same ends, as a union with Christ in the strict sense at all." He refers to a passage (1 Cor. vi. 17) in which the context "definitely excludes the thought of a moral union." A union is intended in it far closer than anything implied in that name.

It seems to me not quite fortunate that all the emphasis should be laid on this side, and I cannot help regretting that the word "mystical" should have been naturalized in Christian theology in such an ambiguous relation to "moral." It is far more appropriate to describe what has not yet reached the moral level than what in some perfectly undefined way has transcended it. It may be piously said, Calvin tells us, provided it come from a pious heart, that nature is God. There is a mystical union of creation with the Creator, and great poets like Wordsworth, or great philosophers like Spinoza, initiate us into it; they reveal

the mystery, and it enters into our intellectual being. There is a mystical union of every stone with God. The stone has its being in Him. Its nature is grounded in His. The physical and chemical laws which enter into the constitution of it, and in virtue of which it holds its place in a universe, are His laws. You can have no relation to it whatever which is not a relation to Him. The term mystical seems to me appropriate enough to describe this kind of union, but for that very reason not so appropriate when we ascend from the world of nature into the world of personality. We may speak of nature still, if we please; but when two persons, two moral natures, are to enter into union with each other, then their union, no matter how intimate and profound it may be, must at the same time be personal and moral. We may call it mystical, if mystical for any reason seems to us an expressive or felicitous term —if there is an ardour, an intimacy, a depth in the emotions it excites to which our ordinary ethical language fails to do justice, and to which justice is done by this impalpable name; but we must not forget that personality lives only in a moral world, and that its most intense and passionate experiences are moral to the core. I entirely agree with Professor Peake that the words "he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit" are very striking, and that "they do not readily lend themselves to anything but a personal identification." Granting the propriety of the term, I entirely agree also that "it is difficult to see how a mystical union could be better described than by this daring sentence." But is not the act in which one person in trust and love "identifies" himself with another, the most purely "moral" of all conceivable acts? Is it not the kind of act which, in its motives, its essence, its fruits, most completely manifests the moral nature? Is there anything in it, or about it or due to it, which is not moral? If the identification of one person with another is the type of a mys-

tical union, surely the contrast of mystical and moral is one which ought to disappear. I feel quite at liberty to say this in spite of St. Paul's reference in 1 Corinthians vi. 17. There is a physical basis for the loftiest human affections, but that does not justify us in bringing down either the union of husband and wife in Christian marriage, or the union of the believer and the Lord, from the moral to the physical world.

The language of "personal identification," to use Professor Peake's expression, is undoubtedly the key to all that has been called mystical in St. Paul. But the language of "personal identification" is the language of love; it is the language of moral passion, and except as the expression of moral passion it has no meaning and no truth whatever. That is why I feel that the contrast of mystical and moral is false, and that it is essentially misleading to speak of a mystical union as opposed to a moral one, or to one which is "merely" moral, or "no more than" moral. When a man abandons himself in faith to the love of God in Christ, when he identifies himself with Christ bearing his sins in His own body on the tree, when he casts himself on Him to die with Him and live with Him, to die with Him and have Him henceforth as his life, he does an act in which there is no element that is not moral, and that has none but moral issues; and this is the act in which he is "mystically" united to Christ. The mysticism of Paul stands in no relation of contrast to morality: it is nothing but morality aflame with passion. Hence I think Professor Peake is unfair to himself in the sentence quoted above—"I should not describe the fact that my will was in harmony with Christ's will, that I passed the same moral judgments and sought the same moral ends, as a union with Christ in the strict sense at all." If the condition so described has been produced in any sinful man by the love of Christ, and by his own response, in love and faith, to Christ, then that man

is experiencing everything that Paul experienced when he spoke of being "in Christ" or of having "Christ live" in him. These are not expressions for a truth transcending morality, they are the passionate expression of moral truth.

The danger of contrasting mystical with moral is that it leads people to speak of union with Christ as a thing to be believed and talked about apart from the passionate moral experience in which it was realized in St. Paul. Everybody who has read "good books" will know what I mean. The language of the Apostle about union to Christ, when taken up at a moral temperature lower than his, does not express a truth of the gospel which a "merely moral" union fails to reach; it expresses nothing at all but the mental and moral deadness of those who can handle holy things without feeling them. Professor Peake thinks I have an "almost fanatical hatred of mysticism": in the legitimate sense of the word, I hope not. But one may be excused if he feels a certain amount of impatience when words of Scripture which live and move and have their being in moral passion—which are born of that passion and serve only to express it—are read as if they belonged to another than the moral world, and expressed truths of that other world to which a union with Christ that is "no more than moral" is a poor and insignificant thing. Of mysticism in this sense I am still thankful to find nothing in the New Testament.

There is something paradoxical in the fact that this way of representing union to Christ should appear to any one to be prejudicial to moral interests—disastrous, as Professor Peake puts it, "in the sphere of the Christian life." I cannot conceive it possible that Christians should differ, if they understand each other, about the place of gratitude in their life, or about its power as a motive. To give it a central place, to make it an all-pervading motive, is not to be guilty of Deism, or of accepting the notion of an absentee

Christ. From such modes of thought I dissent as heartily as Professor Peake. But for the simple reason that the Christian life is a moral life, it must be conceived as produced not mechanically, but through motives. It is not the mechanical outcome of union with Christ; it is the process in which that personal identification of the believer with Christ which alone is the truth of such union, and which is itself a great moral act, is morally expressed and realized. And the all-embracing motive under which it proceeds, and by which it is morally generated, is the sense of obligation to Christ. Christ is present all the time, present clothed in His gospel, making for ever a *moral* appeal to man, and calling forth uninterruptedly a *moral* response—the response of a "personal identification" of the sinner with the Saviour who has suffered and died for him. There is no real truth in the idea of a mystical union—no truth, I mean, for the verification of which we can appeal to experience—that is not covered by this reading of the facts; and I cannot understand why gratitude, which is the psychological co-efficient of this in the sphere of motive, should be supposed inadequate to the effects which it actually produces. Everything in the Christian life has to be produced by motives, and if it is a weak motive to say "I am not my own, I was bought with a price," and to say so in presence of Christ who bought us with His blood, what motive is strong? Professor Peake speaks of men "whose sense of guilt is but feeble: they appreciate only very faintly what sacrifice Christ has made for them; their gratitude is but a wisp of straw to check the mad career of their desires"; and he adds, "yet it is men like these that the gospel cleanses and saves and keeps." But how does the gospel do this? Must we not say that it does it morally, by intensifying the sense of guilt in such men, by deepening their consciousness of what Christ has done for them, and by making their

gratitude a strong cord that cannot be broken, and that binds them for ever to their Lord? We delude ourselves, consciously or unconsciously, when we appeal to a union with Christ which has any other contents than these. To reduce it to the simplest expression, we are saved by grace, and the correlative of grace is gratitude. That is why I still hold that the fundamental doctrine of St. Paul is justification by faith; for faith is the acceptance of grace as what it is, the surrender to it on the unconditional terms which it prescribes. It is only a formal objection to this to say that the fundamental doctrine in theology is the doctrine of God. Of course it is. But what is the Christian doctrine of God? I hope Professor Peake will not be scandalized if I quote St. Paul once more, and say it is this: God as He is revealed and preached in the gospel is He who justifies the ungodly. And it is the abandonment of the sinful soul to this God in unbounded gratitude which morally unites it to Christ and launches it on all the hopes and joys of the new life.

JAMES DENNEY.

THE LETTERS TO THE SEVEN CHURCHES.

VI. Relation of the Christian Books to Contemporary Thought and Language.

It is necessary to have some clear idea with regard to the symbolism employed in the Seven Letters, especially the angels, the stars, and the lampstands or candlesticks. Not that it is proposed to discuss the symbolism of the Apocalypse as a whole, or the religious and theological intention of the writer. Our purpose is much more modest—simply to try to determine what was the meaning which ordinary people of that time, for whom the book was written, would gather from the symbolism employed in the letters. It is proposed to employ the same method in this case, as in all our other investigations—to regard the book as written in the current language, familiar to the people of the time, and not expressed in a peculiar and artificial Christian language: the term "artificial" is required, because if the Christians used a kind of language different from that of the ordinary population, it must have been artificial.

Nor are the thoughts—one might almost say, though the expression must not be misapplied or interpreted in a way different from what is intended—nor are the thoughts of the Christian books alien from and unfamiliar to the period when they were written. They stand in the closest relation to the period. They are made for it: they suit it: they are determined by it.

We take the same view about all the books of the New Testament. They spring from the circumstances of their period, whatever it was in each case; they are suited to its

needs; in a way they think its thoughts, but think them in a new form and on a higher plane; they answer the questions which men were putting, and the answers are expressed in the language which was used and understood at the time. Hence, in the first place, their respective dates can be assigned with confidence, provided we understand the history and familiarize ourselves with the thoughts and ways of the successive periods. No person, who is capable of appreciating the tone and thought of different periods, could place the composition of any of the books of the New Testament in the period of the Antonines, unless he were imperfectly informed of the character and spirit of that period; and the fact that some modern scholars have placed them (or some of them) in that period merely shows with what light-hearted haste some scholars have proceeded to decide on difficult questions of history without the preliminary training and acquisition of the knowledge imperatively required before a fair judgment could be pronounced.

From this close relation of the Christian books to the time in which they originated, arises, e.g., the marvellously close resemblance between the language used about the birth of the divine Augustus and the language used about the birth of Christ. In the words current in the Eastern Provinces, especially in the great and highly educated and "progressive" cities of Asia, shortly before the Christian era, the day of the birth of the (Imperial) God was the beginning of all things; it inaugurated for the world the glad tidings that came through him; through him there was peace on earth and sea: the Providence, which orders every part of human life, brought Augustus into the world, and filled him with the virtue to do good to men: he was the Saviour of the race of men,[1] and so on.

[1] The last expression became stereotyped for all Emperors: so also the phrase about doing benefits to men: the earlier ones are more peculiarly the property of Augustus. The fullest text of the most important inscription was published in *Mittheilungen des Instituts, Athen*, 1899, p. 288 ff.

All this was not merely the language of courtly panegyric. It was in a way thoroughly sincere, with all the sincerity that the people of that over-developed and precocious time, with their artificial, highly stimulated, rather feverish intellect, were capable of feeling.[1] But the very resemblance—so startling, apparently, to those who are suddenly confronted with a good example of it—is the best and entirely sufficient proof[2] that the idea and narrative of the birth of Christ could not be a growth of mythology at a later time, even during the period about 60–100 A.D., but sprang from the conditions and thoughts, and expressed itself in the words, of the period to which it professes to belong. But so far are people from recognizing the true bearing of these facts, and the true relation of the New Testament to the life and thought of its own time, that probably the most fashionable line of argument will soon be that the narrative of the Gospels was a mere imitation of the popular belief about the birth of Augustus, and necessarily took its origin during the time when that popular belief was strong, viz., during the last thirty years of his reign.[3]

but much of it had been published long before; and the thoughts and ideas can be traced in many other channels. Copies of that great official inscription were erected in many of the leading cities of Asia about 9–5 B.C.

[1] The character of the great cities in Asia Minor, and their educational system, are described in EXPOSITOR, Dec. 1901.

[2] It is to a great extent on this and similar evidence that the present writer has based his confident and unhesitating opinion as to the time of origin of the New Testament books, ever since he began to understand the spirit and language of the period. Before he began to appreciate them, he accepted the then fashionable view that they were second century works.

[3] It died with him, of course, and would cease to influence thought within a few years after his death: he was a god only for his lifetime (though a pretence was made of worshipping all the deceased Emperors who were properly deified by decree of the Senate): even in old age, it is doubtful if he continued to make the same impression on his people, but as soon as he died a new god took his place. New ideas and words then ruled among men, for the new god never was heir to the immense public belief which hailed the divine Augustus. With Tiberius began a new era, new thoughts, and new forms.

There are already some signs that, as people begin to learn these facts, which stand before us on the stones engraved before the birth of Christ, this line of argument is beginning to be developed. It will at least have this great advantage, that it assigns correctly the period when the Christian narrative originated, and that it cuts away the ground beneath the feet of those who have maintained that the Gospels are the culmination of a long subsequent growth of mythology about a more or less historical Jesus. The Gospels, as we have them, though composed in the second half, and for the most part in the last quarter, of the first century, are a faithful presentation in thought and word of a much older and well attested history, and are only in very small degree affected by the thoughts and language of the period when their authors wrote, remaining true to the form as fixed by earlier registration.

Similarly, the Seven Letters are the growth of their time, and must be studied along with it. They belong to the second half of Diocletian's reign, 88–96 A.D.; and it is about that time that we may look for the best evidence as to the meaning that they would bear to their original readers.

VII. Symbolism of the Seven Letters: its Meaning.

In the first place we notice that there are two pairs of ideas mentioned in i. 20, "the seven stars are the angels of the Seven Churches; and the seven lampstands are Seven Churches." Of these, the second pair stand on the earth, and in the first pair, since the stars belong to heaven, the angels also must belong to heaven. There is the earthly pair, the Churches and the lampstands that symbolize them; and there is the corresponding heavenly pair, the angels and the stars which symbolize them.

A similar correspondence between a higher and a lower

embodiment of Divine character may frequently be observed in the current religious conceptions of that time. We find amid the religious monuments of Asia Minor certain reliefs, which seem to represent the Divine nature on two planes, expressed by the device of two zones in the artistic grouping. There is an upper zone showing the Divine nature on the higher, what may be called the heavenly plane; and there is a lower zone, in which the god is represented as appearing among the worshippers who come to him on earth, to whom he reveals the right way of approaching him and serving him, and whom he benefits in return for their service and offering duly completed. The best example known to me is dated 100 A.D.,[1] and belongs to the circuit of Philadelphia.[2] But, without an illustration, I need not try to describe its bearing on the subject.

The lampstand, which represents the Church, is a natural and obvious symbol. The Church is Divine: it is the kingdom of God among men in the world: in it shines the light that illumines the darkness of the world.

The heavenly pair is more difficult to express precisely in its relation to the earthly pair. There seems to be involved here a conception, common in ancient time generally, that there are intermediate grades of existence to bridge over the vast gap between the pure Divine nature and the earthly manifestation of it. Thus the star and the angel, of whom the star is the symbol, are the intermediate stage between Christ and His Church with its lamp shining in the world. This symbolism was taken over by St. John from the traditional forms of expression in theories regarding the Divine nature and its relation to the world.

Again, we observe that, in the religious symbolic language

[1] The text is published by Wagener, *Inscriptions recueillies en Asie Mineure*, 1.

[2] See Section II.

of the first century, a star denoted the heavenly existence corresponding to a divine being or divine creation or existence located on earth. Thus, in the language of the Roman poets, the divine figure of the Emperor on earth has a star in heaven that corresponds to it and is its heavenly counterpart. So the imperial family as a whole is also said to have its star, or to be a star. It is a step towards this kind of expression when Horace[1] speaks of the Julian star shining like the moon amid the lesser fires; but still Horace was hardly conscious of having advanced beyond the limits of mere poetic metaphor. But when Domitian built a Temple of the Flavian Family, the poet Statius describes him as placing the stars of his family (the Flavian) in a new heaven.[2] There is implied here a similar conception to that which we are studying in the Revelation: the new Temple on earth corresponds to a new heaven framed to contain the new stars; the divine Emperors of the Flavian family (along with any other member of the family who had been formally deified) are the earthly existences dwelling in the new Temple, as the stars, their heavenly counterparts, move in the new heaven. The parallel is close, however widely separate the theological ideals are; and the date of Statius's poem is about the last year of Domitian's reign, 95–96 A.D.

The star, then, is obviously the heavenly object which corresponds to the lamp shining on the earth, though superior in character and purity to it. Now, as the lamp on earth is to the star in heaven, so is the Church on earth to the angel. Such is the relation clearly indicated. The angel is a corresponding existence on another and higher plane, but more pure in essence, more closely associated with the Divine nature than the individual Church on earth can be.

Now, what is the angel? How shall he be defined or

[1] *Ode* i. 12.

[2] *Silvae*, v. 1, 240 f.

described? In answer to this question, then, one must attempt to describe what is meant by the angels of the Churches in these chapters, although as soon as the description is written, one recognizes that it is inadequate and even incorrect. The angel of the Church seems to embody and gather together in a personification the powers, the character, the history and life and unity of the Church. The angel represents the Divine presence, the Divine element, in the Church; he is the Divine guarantee of the vitality and power of the Church.

This seems clear; but the difficulty begins when we ask what is the relation of the angel to the faults and sins of his Church, and, above all, to the punishment which awaits and is denounced against those sins. The Church in Smyrna or in Ephesus suffers from the faults and weaknesses of the men who compose it: it is guilty of their crimes, and it will be punished in their person. Is the angel, too, guilty of the sins? Is he to bear the punishment for them?

Undoubtedly the angel is touched and affected by the sins of his Church. Nothing else is conceivable. He could not be the counterpart or the double of a Church, unless he was affected in some way by its failings. But the angels of the Churches are addressed, not simply as touched by their faults, but as guilty of them. Most of the angels have been guilty of serious, even deadly sins. The angel of Sardis is dead, though he has the name of being alive. The angel of Sardis is lukewarm and spiritless, and shall be rejected. Threats, also, are directed against the angels. "I will come to thee,"[1] "I will come against thee," "I will spit thee out of my mouth."

The angel is regarded as responsible for any neglect of the warning now given, "and thou shalt not know what

[1] "I will come in displeasure at thee," is the more exact meaning, as Professor Moulton points out.

hour I will come upon thee" : " thou art the wretched one, and poor, and miserable, and blind, and naked." Other passages might be quoted.

These expressions seem to make it clear that the angel could be guilty and must suffer punishment for his guilt. This is certainly surprising, and, moreover, it is altogether inconsistent with our previous conclusion that the angel is the heavenly counterpart of the Church. He who is guilty and responsible for guilt cannot stand anywhere except on the earth.

The inconsistency, however, is due to the inevitable failure of the writer fully to carry out the symbolism. It is not so difficult to follow out an allegory perfectly, so long as the writer confines himself to the realm of pure fancy; but, if he comes into the sphere of reality and fact, he soon finds that the allegory cannot be wrought out completely; it will not fit the details of life. When John addresses the angels as guilty, he is no longer thinking of them, but of the actual Churches which he knew on earth. The symbolism was complicated and artificial; and, when he began to write the actual letters, he began to feel that he was addressing the actual Churches, and the symbolism dropped from him in great degree. He writes to the Church of Ephesus or of Sardis, and not to its angel; or, rather, all distinction between the Church and its angel vanishes from the writer's mind. He comes into direct contact with real life, and thinks no longer of correctness in the use of symbols and in keeping up the elaborate and rather awkward allegory. He writes naturally, directly, and unfettered by symbolical consistency.

In the Apocalypse, as a whole, we must observe that the author was using an established literary form, adapting this traditional device to his own purposes, but often badly fettered and impeded by its fanciful and unreal character. Much of his imagery and symbolism was prescribed for him

by the traditional principles of apocalyptic composition. But sometimes the traditional form breaks in his hands; and he throws away for the moment the shattered fragments. That is the case with the Seven Letters.

It is therefore vain to attempt to give a rigidly accurate definition of the meaning which is attached to the term "angel" in these chapters. All that concerns the angels is vague, impalpable, elusive, defying analysis and scientific precision. You cannot tell where in the Seven Letters, taken one by one, the idea "angel" drops and the idea "church" takes its place. You cannot feel certain what characteristics in the Seven Letters may be regarded as applying to the angels, and what must be separated from them. But the vague description given in our earlier paragraphs will be sufficient for use; and it may be made clearer by quoting Professor J. H. Moulton's description of angels: "Spiritual counterparts of human individuals or communities, dwelling in heaven, but subject to changes depending on the good or evil behaviour of their complementary beings on earth.[1]

How far did St. John, in employing the symbolism current at the time, accept and approve it as a correct statement of truth? That question naturally arises; but the answer seems inevitable. He regards this symbolism merely as a way of making spiritual ideas intelligible to the ordinary human mind, after the fashion of the parables in the life of Christ. He was under the influence of the common and accepted ways of expressing spiritual, or philosophical, or theological truth, just as he was under the

[1] In this description (*Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. iii. p. 514), the words "subject to changes depending on" is another way (and probably a better way) of expressing what I have put in the form "touched or affected by." I intentionally wrote out all that I have said before looking at Professor Moulton's article, though I resolved to read it before printing my own words, and, if it seemed needful, to correct my words from him. I found we were to a great degree in agreement on the facts, though I am not convinced by his argument as to a Zoroastrian origin.

influence of fashionable forms in literature. He took these up and made the best he could of them. The apocalyptic form of literature was far from being a high one; and the Apocalypse of John suffers from the unfortunate choice of this form: only occasionally is the author able to free himself from the chilling influence of that fanciful and extravagant mode of expression. The marked difference in character and power between the Apocalypse and the Gospel of St. John is in great measure due to the poor models which he followed in the former.

It is an interesting fact that one of the most fashionable methods of expressing highly generalized truths or principles —the genealogical method—is never employed by John (except in the universally accepted phrases, "son of man," "Son of God"). The contempt expressed by Paul for the "fables and endless genealogies" of current philosophy and science seems to have been shared by most of the Christian writers; and it is true that no form of veiling ignorance by a show of words was ever invented more dangerous and more tempting than the genealogical.[1] A good example of the genealogical method may be found in Addison's 35th *Spectator*, an imitation of the old form, but humorous instead of pedantic.

VIII. The Letter to the Church in Ephesus.

Each of the Seven Letters opens, as letters in ancient time always did, by stating who sends the message. But the formula does not take the form that it ought to have if the sender of the message were the writer of the letter, viz., "the writer to the person addressed." In the present case the letters are written by John, who imagines

[1] It is unnecessary to repeat what was said about the genealogical method of stating philosophic, or scientific, or historical theories in the Expositor, December, 1901, p. 412.

himself to be only the channel through which they come from the real originator of them; and the exordium is altered to suit this peculiar method. The writer does not name himself; but after naming the person addressed, "To the angel of the Church in Ephesus," he gives a brief description of the originator of the message. The seven descriptions all differ from one another; and, taken together, they make up the complete account given in chap. i. of "One like unto a son of man." This Divine sender of the message seems to present himself in a different aspect to each individual Church; and the seven aspects make up his complete personal description, as if indicating that the Seven different congregations or Churches make up, when taken together, the complete and Universal Church. This expresses in another way what we have tried to express in Section I: the Seven Churches make up the complete Church of the Province Asia, because each of them stands in place of a group of Churches, and (as we now may add) the Church of the Province Asia in its turn stands in place of the Universal Church of Christ.

As was implied in the first of these papers,[1] the letter to an individual Church passes easily into an "Epistle General" to the whole Church, for it embodies general principles of nature, order, and government, which are applicable to all. Similarly, to apply the comparison which was forced upon us in that paper, the Imperial Rescript addressed to a Province or to its governor embodied general principles of administration, which were afterwards regarded as applicable universally (except in so far as they were expressly adapted to an exceptional condition of the Province addressed). But in every case, when an individual Church is addressed, as here, it is addressed in

[1] Expositor, Dec. 1903, p. 401 ff. (an introduction to the series): especially p. 417 f.

and for itself, and its own special individual character and fortunes are clearly present before the writer's mind. He does not think of the Smyrna group when he addresses Smyrna, nor is he thinking of the Universal Church: he addresses Smyrna alone; he has it clear before his mind, with all its special qualities and individuality. Yet the group which had its centre in Smyrna, and the whole Universal Church, alike found that the letter which was written for Smyrna applied equally to them, for it was a statement of eternal truths and universal principles.

It is not to be supposed that the Seven Letters were sent separately to the Seven Churches. The Apocalypse is a book which was never intended to be taken except as a whole; and the Seven Letters are a mere part of this book, and never had any existence except in the book. The Seven Churches had established their representative position before the book was composed; and that is assumed throughout by the author. They stand, in their combination, to him for the entire Province, and the Province stands to him for the entire Church of Christ; but when he is writing to Smyrna or Thyatira, he sees and thinks of Smyrna or Thyatira alone. I hoped that this was made clear in the Section, but it seems that my intention was not understood rightly by some readers.

As to the brief description of the Divine sender, which is prefixed to each of the Seven Letters, it is obvious in several cases that the details selected are peculiarly appropriate to the individual Church addressed. Probably there was a certain suitability in every case, though we cannot always discern it, owing to our ignorance of much of the character and history of the cities.

The message to the Church in Ephesus comes from him "that holdeth the seven stars in his right hand, that walketh in the midst of the seven golden lampstands." If we review the openings of the other six letters, none could

so appropriately be used to the Church in Ephesus as this description. The only one which could for a moment be compared in suitability with it is the opening of the Sardian letter, "he that hath the Seven Spirits of God and the seven stars"; the second part in that case is appropriate to Ephesus, and is almost identical with part of the Ephesian exordium, but the first part is not so strikingly appropriate as the rest of the Ephesian exordium.

Ephesus, as in practical importance the leading city of the Province Asia, might be said in a sense to be in the midst of the Seven Churches; and the Divine figure that addresses her appropriately holds in his hand the seven stars of those Churches. The leading city can stand for the whole Province, as the Province can stand for the whole Church; and that was so customary and usual as to need no explanation or justification. To the Christians, Ephesus and Asia were almost convertible terms; Ephesus stood for Asia, Asia was Ephesus. Hence in the list of equivalent names printed by Parthey as Appendix I. to his edition of *Hierocles et Notitiae Episcopatuum*, the explanation is formally given, No. 40, *Ἀσία ἡ Ἔφεσος*.

As to the holding of the seven stars, Mr. Anderson Scott, in his admirable little edition, published in the Century Bible, remarks that, "in the image before the eye of the Seer the seven stars probably appear as a chain of glittering jewels hanging from the hand of Christ." This image suits excellently the description which we have given already of the Seven Churches as situated on the circling road that goes forth from Ephesus, traverses them all in succession and returns to its point of origin in the representative city of the Province.

W. M. Ramsay.

TRANSLATIONS FROM THE PROPHETS.

IX.

Jeremiah XXX.–XXXI.

Promises of Restoration.

XXX. [1] The word that came to Jeremiah from Yahweh, saying, [2] Thus speaketh Yahweh, the God of Israel, saying, Write thee all the words that I have spoken unto thee in a book. [3] For, lo, the days come, saith Yahweh, that I will turn the captivity of my people Israel and Judah, saith Yahweh; and I will bring them back unto the land that I gave to their fathers, and they shall possess it.

[4] And these are the words that Yahweh spake concerning Israel and concerning Judah.

*A Day of Judgement is coming upon the World, out of which, however, Israel will be delivered.**

[5] For thus saith Yahweh: (Ye say,) 'A voice of trembling have we heard; there is terror, and no peace.'† [6] Ask ye, now, and see whether a man doth travail with child? wherefore do I see every man with his hands on his loins, as a woman in travail, and all faces are turned into paleness?‡ [7] Ah! for that day is great; whence is any like it?§ and it is a time of trouble for Jacob; but he shall be saved out of it. [8] And it shall come to pass in that day,

* Comp. the description in Isa. 13. 6-15 of the terrors accompanying the day of Babylon's fall, which is also (14. 1 f.) to end in Israel's deliverance; and the judgement described in Isa. 24, which ends similarly (*vv.* 14 f., 23, 25. 1–8).

† Yahweh is represented here as quoting the words in which the people are supposed to express their consternation when the judgement breaks upon the earth.

‡ Men do not suffer the pains of child-bearing; what, then, is the cause of the terror and agony which they are all displaying?

§ So the Heb. text. Or, with other vowel-points (A.V., R.V.), *so that none is like it* (מֵאֵין for מֵאַיִן).

saith Yahweh of hosts, that I will break his yoke from off his* neck, and will burst his * thongs; and strangers shall no more use him as their servant:† [9] but they ‡ shall serve Yahweh their God, and David their king, § whom I will raise up unto them. [10] And thou, fear thou not, O Jacob, my servant, saith Yahweh; neither be dismayed, O Israel: for, lo, I will save thee from afar, and thy seed from the land of their captivity; and Jacob shall return, and shall be in rest and at ease, and none shall make him afraid.‖ [11] For I am with thee, saith Yahweh, to save thee: for I will make a full end of all the nations whither I have scattered thee, only of thee will I not make a full end: but I will correct thee with judgement,¶ and will in no wise leave thee unpunished.**

Israel, for her Sins, has suffered greatly: Ruin and Exile have fallen upon her: but now Yahweh will heal her Wounds, and she will be freed from her Oppressors.

[12] For thus saith Yahweh, Thy breach, (O Zion,)†† is incurable, and thy wound grievous.‡‡ [13] There is none to

* So LXX (except that the pron. is plural, 'their'). The Heb. text has *thy* (an error due probably to a scribe who supposed Israel to be addressed, and who also, perhaps, had Isa. 10. 27 in his mind: see, however, the next clause).

† Heb. *work with* (or *by*) *him*. See in the Heb. 22. 13; also 25. 14, 27. 7, where this is to be the fate of the Chaldaeans themselves.

‡ I.e. the Israelites.

§ The second David, the ideal king of the future, as David was of the past: cf. Hos. 3. 5, Ezek. 34. 23, 24, 37. 24, 25.

‖ Or, *disturb him*. The expression is used of sheep lying undisturbed upon their pastures (Isa. 17. 2); and of people, Lev. 26. 6, Ezek. 34. 28, 39. 26, Mic. 4. 4, Zeph. 3. 13.

¶ I.e. in a judicial spirit, not in anger (Ps. 6. 1, 38. 1), tantamount to *in measure* (A.V.).

** Or, *hold thee guiltless*.

†† See *v.* 17. In *vv.* 10–17 the pronouns are throughout feminine, showing that 'Zion,' i.e. not the place, but the personified community, the 'daughter of Zion,' is addressed. Cf. on 7. 29, 10. 7.

‡‡ Heb. *made sick*. Cf. 10. 19.

plead thy cause: [there are no] medicines for the sore;* there is no plaister for thee. [14] All thy lovers† have forgotten thee; they seek not thee:‡ for I have wounded thee with the wound of an enemy, with the chastisement of a cruel one; because of the greatness of thine iniquity, (and because) thy sins were increased. [15] Why criest thou because of thy breach? thy pain is incurable: because of the greatness of thine iniquity, (and because) thy sins were increased, I have done these things unto thee. [16] Therefore§ all they that devour thee shall be devoured; and all thine adversaries, every one of them, shall go into captivity; and they that spoil thee shall be a spoil, and all that prey upon thee will I give for a prey.‖ [17] For I will bring up fresh flesh for thee,¶ and I will heal thee of thy wounds, saith Yahweh; because they have called thee Outcast, (saying,) 'It is Zion; she hath none to seek (after her).' **

The Exiles will return, Jerusalem will be rebuilt, and again enjoy Prosperity, under the Rule of an independent Prince of David's Line.

[18] Thus saith Yahweh: Behold I will turn the captivity of Jacob's tents, and have compassion on his dwelling-places; and the city shall be builded upon her own mound,†† and the palace shall be inhabited‡‡ after its accustomed manner. [19] And out of them shall proceed thanksgiving and the voice of those that make merry: and I will multiply them, and they shall not be

* Properly, *a compressed place*, i.e. a *bound up wound*. So Hos. 5. 13; cf. the verb 'bound up' in Isa. 1. 6.

† I.e. thy allies; cf. 22. 20.

‡ Or, 'care not for *thee*' (the pron. is emphatic): cf. *v.* 17.

§ Viz., because of the extremity of thy need.

‖ With the thought of this verse, comp. Isa. 14. 2, 51. 22 f.

¶ See 8. 22.

** Or, *care* (*for her*). See Deut. 11. 12, Ps. 142. 4 (where the Heb. verb is the same); and comp. the opposite in Isa. 62. 12.

†† I.e. upon its former site.

‡‡ Heb. *shall sit*: see on 17. 25.

diminished ;* I will also glorify them, and they shall not be small.† [20] Their children also shall be as aforetime, and their congregation shall be established before me,‡ and I will punish all that oppress them. [21] And their noble shall be of themselves, and their ruler shall proceed from the midst of them : § and I will cause him to draw near, and he shall approach unto me ; ‖ for who is he that (else) hath had boldness¶ to approach unto me? saith Yahweh. [22] And ye shall be to me a people, and I will be to you a God.

*The Approach of the Judgement upon the Wicked.***

[23] Behold the tempest of Yahweh, fury is gone forth, a sweeping tempest : it shall whirl round upon the head of the wicked. [24] The fierce anger of Yahweh will not return, until he have executed, and till he have performed, the intents of his heart : in the latter days ye shall understand it.

A Promise of Restoration to the Israelites of the Northern Kingdom.

XXXI. At that time, saith Yahweh, I will be a God unto all the families of Israel, and they shall be to me a people. [2] Thus saith Yahweh : The people which survived the sword hath found grace in the wilderness :†† I will go that I may

* Cf. 29. 6.

† I.e. be of small account. Comp. Job 16. 21 Heb.

‡ I.e. under my eye and care (Gen. 17. 18, Hos. 6. 2); cf. Ps. 102. 28.

§ I.e. no foreigner will rule over them : they will be under the rule of a native prince.

‖ I.e. their future native ruler will have the right of access to the altar, and enjoy priestly privileges ; comp. the same two verbs in Num. 16. 5 ; Lev. 21. 21, 23 ; Ezek. 44. 13.

¶ Heb. *hath gone surety for his heart* (courage) ; i.e. who has ever guaranteed to himself the courage to do this of his own accord, unauthorized by me? Cf. Est. 7. 5 (lit. '*whose heart* [courage] *hath filled him* to do so').

** *Vv.* 23. 24 are repeated, with slight verbal differences, from 23. 19, 20.

†† The 'wilderness' is here fig. of the land of exile : and the meaning

cause Israel to rest. 'From afar * hath Yahweh appeared unto me,† (saying,) And with everlasting love have I loved thee: therefore draw I thee with kindness.' Again will I build thee, and thou shalt be built, O virgin of Israel: again shalt thou adorn thee with thy timbrels,‡ and go forth in the dances of them that make merry. [5] Again shalt thou plant vineyards upon the mountains of Samaria: the planters shall plant, and enjoy§ (the fruit thereof). [6] For there *will* be a day when the (vineyard-)keepers‖ in the highlands of Ephraim shall cry, 'Arise ye, and let us go up to Zion unto Yahweh our God.'¶

Ephraim's happy Return from Exile.

[7] For thus saith Yahweh: Ring out with gladness for Jacob, and cry aloud** at the head of the nations; publish ye, praise ye, and say, 'Yahweh hath saved his people,††

is that such of the long-exiled Israelites as have escaped destruction will now find favour from Yahweh in their banishment. The past tense, 'hath found,' is the 'prophetic' past, the prophet viewing the future as accomplished, and describing it accordingly.

* I.e. from Zion,—the people being supposed to be in the land of their exile.

† If 'me' is right, the people in exile must be supposed to be suddenly introduced as speaking in this verse. But LXX has *unto him* (לוֹ for לִי) i.e. unto Israel, which is very possibly right. The inverted commas will then disappear.

‡ Or, *hand-drums*, i.e. a ring of wood or metal, covered with a tightly drawn skin, held up in one hand, and struck by the fingers of the other. Cf., in connexion with dances, Ex. 15. 20, Jud. 11. 34.

§ Heb. *treat as common*—the first produce of fruit-trees being regarded as sacred, and not used for food (see Lev. 19. 23–25). The same word is used in the same sense in Deut. 20. 6, 28. 30.

‖ Or, more generally, *(orchard-)keepers*. Such seems to be the only legitimate rendering of נֹצְרִים: see Job 27. 18, and cf. Isa. 27. 3, Prov. 27. 18. So 2 Kings 17. 9=18. 8 (the '*keepers*' tower'). נצר is *to keep*: it does not mean to 'watch' in the sense of *to look out*, but only to 'watch' in the sense of *to guard*.

¶ A mark that the schism between the Northern and Southern kingdoms is ended.

** So R.V., for the same Heb., Isa. 12. 6, 24. 14, 54. 1.

†† So LXX, Targ. The Heb. text has, *save thy people*. But the verse is evidently intended as a thanksgiving for the deliverance *accomplished* (cf. Isa. 48. 20*b*).

the remnant of Israel.' [8] Behold, I will bring them from the north country, and gather them from the uttermost corners of the earth, among them the blind and the lame, the woman with child and her that travaileth with child together: a great company shall they return hither. [9] They shall come with weeping, and with supplications will I lead them: I will bring them unto streams of water,* in an even way wherein they shall not stumble: for I am become (again) a father to Israel, and Ephraim is my first-born.

[10] Hear the word of Yahweh, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off; and say, 'He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him, as a shepherd doth his flock.' [11] For Yahweh hath ransomed Jacob, and redeemed him from the hand of him that was stronger than he. [12] And they shall come and ring out (their joy) in the height of Zion, and flow together unto the bounty of Yahweh, to the corn, and to the must,† and to the fresh oil, and to the young of the flock and of the herd: and their soul shall be as a watered garden; and they shall not pine ‡ any more at all. [13] Then shall the virgin rejoice in the dance, and the young men and the old together; and I will turn their mourning into joy, and will comfort them, and make them rejoice from their sorrow. [14] And I will satiate § the soul || of the priests with fatness,¶ and

* Cf. Isa. 49. 10*b*.

† See on this rendering the note in my *Joel and Amos*, p. 79 f.

‡ See Lev. 26. 16 (R.V. 'make the soul to *pine away*'), Deut. 28. 65 (R.V. '*pining* of soul'), Ps. 88. 9 ('wasteth away').

§ Lit. *saturate*, Isa. 55. 10 (where 'watereth' is not quite strong enough; cf. *v.* 12 above, properly a *saturated* or *thoroughly moistened* garden), often used fig. for *fill fully*: e.g. Isa. 43. 24, Lam. 3. 15 (R.V. 'sated'), Ps. 36. 8 ('abundantly satisfied').

|| I.e. the *appetite*,—the 'soul' being viewed by the Hebrews as the seat of desire, and in particular of *appetite*: cf. Num. 11. 6, Mic. 7. 1, Ps. 107. 18, Job 33. 20, Prov. 23. 2 (where 'a man given to appetite' is בעל נפשׁ, lit. *a possessor of soul*), 27. 7; and see further the Glossary to my *Parallel Psalter*, p. 460.

¶ Or, *richness*. (Not the usual word for *fat*; but often used fig. of rich

my people shall be satisfied with my bounty, saith Yahweh.

The Prophet hears in Imagination Rachel, the Mother of Joseph and Benjamin, bewailing from her Grave, near Ramah, the Exile of her Sons: but Yahweh bids her stay her Grief; there is still Hope for her Sons' Return.

15 Thus saith Yahweh: A voice is heard in Ramah,* lamentation, (and) bitter weeping, Rachel weeping for her children; she refuseth to be comforted for her children, because they are not. 16 Thus saith Yahweh: Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears: for there *is* a reward for thy work, saith Yahweh; and they shall return from the land of the enemy. 17 And there *is* hope for thy latter end, saith Yahweh; and (thy) children shall return to their own border.

The Ground of this Hope is Ephraim's Penitence, which enables Yahweh to welcome his Prodigal Home with Affection.

18 I have surely heard Ephrain bemoaning himself, (and saying,) 'Thou hast corrected me, and I let myself be corrected, as a calf untrained:† O bring me back,‡ that I may return (to thee); for thou art Yahweh my God. 19 For after that I turned (from thee),§ I have repented; and after that I was brought to knowledge, I have smitten upon my

satisfaction: see Isa. 55. 2 *end*, Ps. 36. 8; and cf. the cognate verb in Prov. 11. 25, 13. 4, 15. 30, 28. 25.)

* Ramah was five miles north of Jerusalem. Rachel's grave (see 1 Sam. 10. 2, 3) was on the north border of Benjamin, not far from Bethel (which was ten miles north of Jerusalem), and, to judge from the present passage, at no great distance from Ramah either (see *D.B.* s.v. Rachel).

† Which has to be taught by punishment to work and bear the yoke.

‡ I.e. take me back (15. 18), like a prodigal but repentant son. Or the words may be rendered, *O turn me, and I will turn* (in penitence): but *v.* 19 seems to show that Ephraim is pictured as *already* penitent, at the time when he is represented as speaking these words.

§ For the two opposite senses of 'turn' in the same context, cf. 3. 12, 14, 22, 8. 4.

thigh : * I am put to shame, yea, even confounded, because I do bear the reproach of my youth.' [20] Is Ephraim my dear son? is he a delightsome child? that as often as I speak against him, I do earnestly remember him still? therefore my bowels yearn † for him; I will surely have compassion upon him, saith Yahweh.

Let exiled Ephraim, then, bethink herself of her Journey Home.

[21] Set thee up waymarks, make thee guide posts; set thine heart toward the highway, even the way by which thou wentest: ‡ return, O virgin of Israel, return to these thy cities. [22] How long wilt thou go hither and thither,§ O thou backturning daughter? for Yahweh hath created a new thing in the earth, A woman shall compass a man.‖

* A gesture of grief, Ezek. 21. 12.

† Cf. Isa. 63. 15 (R.V.).

‡ I.e. turn thy thoughts to the way by which thou wentest into exile, that thou mayest not miss thy way back.

§ Viz. in hesitation and uncertainty.

‖ I.e., probably, In the new future (Isa. 43. 19, 48. 6, 7, 65. 17) which Yahweh is purposing to create in the earth, the woman, instead of holding aloof and waiting to be sought by the man (typifying Yahweh), will affectionately cling round her divine husband (Hos. 2. 16; Isa. 54. 5, 6): why, then, should Ephraim, the 'virgin of Israel,' defer to yield herself to the Divine purpose? The word rendered 'compass' may mean either to *come about* or *surround* (Deut. 32. 10, Ps. 7. 7, 32. 10), or to *go round about* (Ps. 26. 6, 55. 10, 59. 6, 14, Cant. 3. 2). Rashi and Kimchi explain *go about* in the sense of *go about after*, i.e. seek in marriage,—Kimchi, for instance, saying, 'It is the way of mankind for the man to go about after the woman; but then the woman will go about after her husband, as though to say that the children of Israel will return to their God and He will redeem them: cf. Hos. 3. 5.' Dean Plumptre explains similarly, 'In the normal order of man's life, the bridegroom woos the bride; in the spiritual relationship which the prophet has in view, this shall be inverted, and Israel, the erring but repentant wife, shall woo her divine husband.' This yields an excellent sense, the only doubt attaching to it being, whether 'to go about' (not 'to go about *after*') would by itself mean definitely 'to woo.' The explanation given above, however, is not substantially different. The Heb. word for 'woman' is the one commonly rendered 'female.'

Judah, too, will be restored, as well as Ephraim.

[23] Thus saith Yahweh of hosts, the God of Israel: Yet again shall they use this speech in the land of Judah and in the cities thereof, when I shall turn their captivity, 'Yahweh bless thee, O habitation* of righteousness,† O holy mountain!' ‡ [24]And Judah and all the cities thereof § shall dwell therein together; as husbandmen, and they that move about with flocks. || [25] For I have satiated ¶ the weary soul, and every pining ** soul have I replenished. [26] Upon this I awaked, and beheld; and my sleep †† was sweet unto me.

Yahweh will then be watchful over His restored People; and will so transform the Constitution of Society that, whereas now the Children suffer for their Fathers' Sins, then the bitter Consequences of Sin will be confined to the Sinner.

[27] Behold, the days come, saith Yahweh, that I will sow the house of Israel and the house of Judah with the seed of man, and with the seed of beast. [28] And it shall come to pass, that like as I have been wakeful over them, to pluck up, and to break down, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to afflict; so will I be wakeful over them, to build, and to plant, saith Yahweh. [29] In those days they shall say no more, 'The fathers have eaten unripe grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge.' [30] But every one shall

* More exactly, *homestead* (2 Sam. 7. 8, Jer. 10. 25, 23. 3); used poetically in a more general sense (cf. Exod. 15. 13, and of Yahweh, ch. 50. 7).

† The inhabitants of the restored Jerusalem are pictured as invested with ideal perfections: cf. Isa. 1. 26, 32. 1, 16 f., 61. 3.

‡ The cities of Judah and the temple being rebuilt, pilgrims or others visiting the capital will thus greet Jerusalem and Zion.

§ I.e. their inhabitants. Cf. similarly 11. 12, 26. 2.

|| The men of Judah will then be able to till their land, and move about with their flocks, unmolested. Cf. Isa. 30. 23.

¶ See on *v.* 14.

** Cf. *v.* 12.

†† I.e. the dream, or reverie, in which the preceding happy prospects had come before him.

die for his own iniquity: every man that eateth the unripe grapes, his teeth shall be set on edge.

The Prophecy of the new Covenant. Israel, in the ideal Future, is to be ruled, not by a System of Observances, imposed from without, but by a Law written in the Heart, a Principle operative from within, filling all with the Knowledge of Yahweh, and prompting all to ready and perfect Obedience.

31 Behold, the days come, saith Yahweh, that I will make
a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the
house of Judah: 32 not according to the covenant that I
made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the
hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my
covenant *they* brake, although *I* was an husband unto
them,* saith Yahweh: 33 but this is the covenant that I will
make with the house of Israel after those days, saith Yah-
weh: I will put my law in their inward parts, and upon
their hearts will I write it; and I will be to them a God,
and they shall be to me a people. 34 And they shall teach
no more every man his neighbour, and every man his
brother, saying, 'Know Yahweh': for they shall all know
me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith
Yahweh: for I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin will
I remember no more.

Two solemn Promises of the national Permanence of Israel.

35 Thus saith Yahweh, which giveth the sun for a light
by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for
a light by night, which stirreth up the sea so that the
waves thereof roar (Yahweh of hosts is His name): 36 If
these ordinances depart from before me, saith Yahweh,
then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation
before me for ever.

* Cf. 3. 14.

37 Thus saith Yahweh: If heaven above can be measured,
and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath,
then will I also cast off the whole seed of Israel for all
that they have done, saith Yahweh.

Jerusalem will be rebuilt, even beyond its former Limits, and be holy to Yahweh.

38 Behold, the days come, saith Yahweh, that the city
shall be built to Yahweh from the tower of Ḥănan'ēl* unto
the corner-gate.† 39 And the measuring line shall go out
further straight onward unto the hill Gareb, and shall
(then) turn round unto Goah.‡ 40 And the whole vale (of)
the dead bodies and (of) the ashes,§ and all the fields unto
the brook Kidron, unto the corner of the horse gate‖
toward the east, shall be holy unto Yahweh; it shall not
be plucked up, nor pulled down any more for ever.¶

* At the N.E. corner of the city: cf. Neh. 3. 1, 12. 39.

† At the N.W. corner of the city: cf. 2 Kings 14. 13; 2 Chron. 26. 9. These two points thus define the N. wall of the city: comp. especially the similar promise in Zech. 14. 10.

‡ Gareb and Goah are not mentioned elsewhere. The hill, Gareb, was apparently some point in the W. wall of the city, where the wall made a turn to the S. till it reached Goah,—presumably at the W. end of the S. wall.

§ Probably the broad open depression (Heb. *'ēmeḳ'*) just S. of Siloam, where the Wādy er-Rabābī, the Tyropoeon valley, and the Wādy of the Kidron meet (see the plan in *Encycl. Bibl.*, ii., facing col. 2419–20). This would be at the mouth of the valley of the son of Hinnom, which is doubtless alluded to here (cf. chap. 7. 31, 19. 4–6; 2 Kings 23. 10), whether that were the Wādy er-Rabābī, or, as W. R. Smith argued with considerable force (see *ibid.* col. 2423–4), the Tyropoeon valley.

‖ On the E. of Jerusalem, a little S. of the modern 'golden gate' (now walled up), and overlooking the Wādy of the Kidron, at the S.E. corner of the Temple Courts (Neh. 3. 28; 2 Kings 11. 16=2 Chron. 23. 15).

¶ Jerusalem is to be rebuilt, and (*v.* 40) certain districts on the S. and S.E., excluded from the old city, and regarded as unclean, are to be included in it. The whole city, thus formed, is to be holy to Yahweh (cf. Joel 3. 17; Zech. 14. 20 f.).

NOTES.

XXXI. 2. *I will go*, etc. See G.-K. §§ 113*dd*, 131*m*. 'When I went' is not a legitimate rendering of הלוך.

18. In the rend. of A.V., R.V., here, 'turn thou me, and I shall *be turned*' (cf. Lam. 5. 21), 'be turned' is to be understood, not as a passive, but in the *neuter* sense, which it often had in Old English, and which is unquestionably found in A.V.: see especially Jer. 34. 15, where A.V. has 'were turned' for exactly the same Heb. (ותשובו) which in *v.* 16 is rendered 'turned'; and Rev. 1. 12, where ἐπέστρεψα is rendered 'I turned,' and ἐπιστρέψας, just afterwards, in the same verse, 'being turned' (comp. Acts 15. 19, by the side of 11. 21, the Greek in both passages being the same). Cf. my *Parallel Psalter*, p. 483.

24. For '*as* husbandmen' cf. Job 24. 5 (G.-K. § 118*r*): for 'and they that,' etc., cf. Ps. 22. 29 [Heb. 30] (as in R.V., but with 'and' for 'even'), Mal. 2. 16 (G.-K. § 155*n*): this construction is, however somewhat forced here, and it is simpler to read the participle וְנֹסְעֵי for ונסעו (G.-K. § 130*a*), the sense remaining the same.

40. For the construction at the beginning of the verse, see my *Tenses*, § 188. 1, or G.-K. §§ 127*h*, 131*d*.

S. R. Driver.

WAS "THE WEEPING PROPHET" A PESSIMIST?

"PROSPERITY is the blessing of the Old Testament, and adversity of the New" is the sententious declaration of Lord Bacon, and with equal assurance some modern writers assert that the Jewish Scriptures are optimistic, those of the New Testament pessimistic. In this paper we shall examine the first of these statements. It is based sometimes on the fact that in the very forefront of the sacred literature of the Hebrews we meet with the expression, "And, behold, it was very good." But, then, a few pages further on we have the story of the Fall, which, with its consequences, Schopenhauer tells us, reconciled him with the Old Testament. E. von Hartmann, in his pessimistic history of religious philosophy, deduces from Hebrew monotheism this tendency towards optimistic views of life; so that even the pessimistic author of Ecclesiastes leans towards an easy-going Epicureanism which tries to make the best of life. We willingly admit this statement; in accepting prosperity as a Divine gift in case of obedience to the law, and adversity as a moral discipline or a type of Divine displeasure, the Jewish mind is saved from pessimistic despair: so that, on the whole, as a modern Jewish writer puts it, "Joyousness is the predominating characteristic of Judaism." Yet with some of the utterances of the Book of Job before us, and certain passages in Ecclesiastes and the "resignation Psalms," not to mention others, we cannot accept the sweeping statement that "all Jews are optimists."

For what is optimism? According to Voltaire's definition of it in *Candide*, the book which contains the most witty criticism, as well as the most merciless condemnation of the optimism of Leibnitz, it is "the rage to maintain

that all is well when one is ill at ease." Such is not the outcome of Hebrew thought as reflected in the Canonical books. On the contrary, there is a kind of transient pessimism in the Book of Job, where it dwells on the insolubility of life's problem, and the difficulties of belief in a moral government of the world; nothing but the overpowering consciousness of the absolute power of the inscrutable Deity saves the writer from despair. Ecclesiastes has been called by an avowed pessimist the Catechism of pessimism, as the author speaks here in a "sardonic tone of persiflage," peculiar to the higher forms of pessimistic literature. But his pessimism, such as it is, differs widely from the "*blasé* pessimism" of the modern school of continental pessimism or the intellectual pessimism to which Matthew Arnold gives expression in the following lines taken from his "Empedocles on Etna":

> I alone
> Am dead to life and joy, therefore I read
> In all things my own deadness.

Still, there are expressions which bear some resemblance to the ironical self-introspective pessimism of the moderns in their painful efforts to "escape from brain-weariness." The Psalms here and there are full of sadness and sorrow, so that some of them have been classed as "threnodies of lamentation" on account of their resemblance to the Lamentations of Jeremiah. In Jeremiah, the most tragic figure in the most tragic period of Jewish history, we have a typical representative of Hebrew pessimism. He is "the weeping prophet." "Oh that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears" (Jer. ix. 1, 10). "Let mine eyes run down with tears night and day, and let me not cease, for the virgin daughter of my people" (xiv. 17). He is the "illustrious mourner" portrayed by Michael Angelo with downcast eyes and gloomy meditation, brooding over the sad fate of his people. In his individual

character—"Is there any sorrow like unto my sorrow?"—in his prophetic mission as "the evening star of the declining day of prophecy," in his acts and sufferings as a patriot, and in his reflections as "the first religious thinker" with bitter sorrow gnawing at his heart, we have a complete study of Hebrew pessimism. And this, moreover suggests further comparison between Semitic and Arian, Oriental and Western, ancient and modern forms of pessimism, as one of the leading modes of thought in the present day.

The characteristic features in Jeremiah's individuality are a passionate intensity and stern veracity mingled with pathetic, almost feminine, tenderness, a capacity for indignant invective, with occasional fits of diffidence and self-distrust which make him, as a "human document," one of the most engaging figures in history. In the "confession of Jeremiah" and the memorials of his life contained in his own writings, supplemented by his friend and faithful disciple Baruch, we have, as Professor Cheyne says, a most "fascinating psychical problem." Gentle in his general bearing, he becomes at times vehement when harassed by open and secret dangers; as a young man disillusionized at his birthplace Anathoth, the city of priests, by the sight of priestly corruption, later on arriving at Jerusalem, like Luther at Rome, he is struck with horror by worse sins perpetrated at the sacred shrine, the centre of piety, at the very threshold of the Holy of Holies; in the further course of his restless career a natural disposition to pessimistic views gathers strength. He is 'the man who has seen affliction" (Lam. iii. 1). But his pessimism never becomes that of rage and resentment, as in Schopenhauer, it is modified by the religious sense of dutiful resignation to the Divine will. His feeling of utter loneliness in the crowd of unsympathetic countrymen saddens his soul, and with the quick sensibility of a refined

mind he shrinks from contact with the crimes and sins he witnesses in the city, in the court, in the sanctuary. What he sees and suffers, however, does not produce a sour misanthropy. Unlike Schopenhauer, he does not dwell with savage delight on the depraved worthlessness and abject meanness of his fellow-men. His enemies furnish him with sufficient ground for scorn and distrust, and the depressing influences of his environment produce occasionally doubts and misgivings as to his own mission, as when he apostrophizes the Divine Author of inspiration in those strange words: "Wilt Thou, indeed, be unto me a deceitful *brook*, as waters that are not sure?" (xv. 18, R.V., margin).

But from such temporary attacks of sceptical pessimism he recovers quickly and listens to the reassuring voice, which bids him stand forth as a "brazen wall" against all opposition and assures him of Divine support (*ib. vv.* 19–20). In the palace and in the temple, or as a prisoner among the officers in the courtyard, he boldly denounces the mischievous political Chauvinism of the hierarchical faction, as well as the aggressive formalism of religious bigotry. With equal severity he denounces the semi-heathenism of the populace, mixing up pagan rites such as the worship of the "queen of heaven" with the service of Jehovah. Yet all the while his tender love for his misguided countrymen remains unimpaired. Now and then he is carried away by his feelings, and in a moment of great stress, like Job, curses the day on which he was born, perhaps, as Kautzsch suggests, in the night of his incarceration (see chap. xx. 7, 29, and 14 *seq.*). It is the result of momentary aberration of mind; the paroxysm of grief passes away and sanity returns; he does not from his own sad experiences deduce Schopenhauer's general maxim that man's highest aim should be "the extinction of the will to live." There is a higher and a lower element in Jeremiah, as in all high-wrought natures;

there are the two voices, one of despair, and one of hope, but it is the latter which prevails in the end. He may despair for a moment of human nature, the vision of national decay and his own misery may cloud his judgement; but neither the one nor the other will prevent the revival of faith in his own mission and the destiny of his race. The savage contempt for his contemporaries expressed in the deliberate utterances of Schopenhauer have no counterpart here. In his gentle tenderness and timid shrinking the martyr soul of Jeremiah suffers "as a lamb"; he gives vent to his grief: "My bowels, my bowels! I am pained at my very heart; my heart is disquieted within me: I cannot hold my peace," he cries, amid scenes of woe and destruction. "For my people is foolish, they are sottish children, and they have none understanding: they are wise to do evil, but to do good they have no understanding" (chap. iv. 19 *seq.*, cf. viii. 20 *seq.*). When Schopenhauer saw a picture of the Abbé Ramé, the restorer of the Trappist order, he turned away from it with a gesture indicating pain, exclaiming, "That is grace!" It is the grace of resigned suffering he lacked, and which Jeremiah possessed in abundance.

We will next consider Jeremiah as the patriotic prophet, "the prophet as poet," giving vent to "the agony of the expiring nation," raising the Cassandra cry of warning, and threatening "the sword, famine, and pestilence" with painful iteration. He is the prophet of ill, suspected of treason by his countrymen, who, after the fulfilment of his gloomy vaticinations, gives expression to "the national mourning." In this he is not altogether unlike a modern pessimistic poet, Leopardi, bewailing the misfortunes of his beloved Italy, "the Niobe of nations." For twenty-three or twenty-four years he is the most prominent figure in the Jewish state, and from the beginning of sorrows to the end of the fruitless struggles for national independence he

remains the firm adversary of the dangerous *Welt-politik* of the leaders in Church and State and the uncompromising opponent of that torqueous policy which leans now on this, now on that foreign alliance, alternately "drinking the bitter waters of the Nile and the Euphrates." But in vain. He might weep, but he could not ward off the final doom. It is to him that the Chronicler ascribes the dirge on the death of Josiah (2 Chron. xxxv. 25); it is he who utters the pathetic cry over "the young usurper Jehoahaz" when carried away into Egypt: "Weep not for the dead, neither bemoan him: but weep sore for him that goeth away; for he shall return no more, nor see his native country." So in his "watch songs" he laments the terrible devastations of his native land by the Scythian incursions. When the blow comes which he had foreseen, when the court, the nobles, the priests and court prophets, as well as the flower of the people, were carried away to Babylon, he utters the piteous cry: "O land, land, land!" over the country, which strangers have taken in possession. When, after the futile attempt to break the foreign yoke under the *roi-fainéant* Zedekiah, city and temple are destroyed, and the ploughshare of captivity passes over the soil of the land he loves so ardently, Jeremiah, according to the current tradition incorporated in the Septuagint superscription, indites those sad poems ever since styled "the Lamentations of Jeremiah," though in the Hebrew canon neither his nor any other author's name is mentioned. Yet even the higher criticism notes a psychical plausibility in this traditional theory, though some of the contents of the book could not from internal evidence be ascribed to his penmanship. Probably his own contributions together with the rest, are, as Budde suggests, a development of the "Kinoth"—(קִינוֹת 2 Sam. i. 17, 2 Chron. xxxv. 25, Amos. v. 1)—originating in the *Leichenlied*, or funeral wails of the women who make lamentations (see Chron. ix. 17). And this suggestion finds some

support in the Greek title of Lamentations, θρῆνοι, corresponding to the German derivative *Thräne* = tear, ascribed naturally to the "weeping prophet," and contemporary of the events to which they allude.

Whoever was the author (or authors) of these threnodies, later on improved upon, as is surmised on good grounds, by "literary craftsmen" to adapt them for liturgical use, their general tone is quite in keeping with the rest of Jeremiah's writings, and the question arises whether, in view of this, his contemporaries were right in regarding him as a confirmed pessimist. Does he belong to that sad but noble brotherhood who learn in sorrow what they teach in song, and that section of it in particular, who give emphatic expression in their poetic strains to the *dolore universale*, like Leopardi, whose poems were used in the darker days of German history as the book of devotion for pessimists? For nowhere is the pessimism of the patriot who despairs of human nature and social and political reform more touchingly expressed than in his lyrics. Here self-pity and the lonely sorrow of the man, out of harmony with nature, with himself, and his family, afflicted with bodily suffering and mental distress, find their expression, as, e.g., in the following lines addressed to Italy, then, like Judea, under the yoke of the foreigner :—

> Weep, Italy; right well thy tears may flow,
> Who'st other nations born
> To excel in thy prosperity of woe!

Here he resembles the Hebrew poet. But not so in another of his poems, when, rising in revolt against the appointed order of things, like his contemporary Byron in *Cain*, he arraigns in strains of bitter irony the higher powers for permitting the evil that is under the sun :—

> Perchance these playful gods our toils and pains,
> Bitter experiences and ill-starred love
> Decreed as sport unto their leisure-hours.

Still less so when he declaims against the cruelty of Nature and its Author—

> The whole creation yearns
> For rest from pain, accursed where'er it turns,
> Where'er it refuge seeks!
> Thy will was law to thee
> That youthful hope should be
> By life deluded, and life's course should run
> Replete with cares; that death should be the one
> Defence 'gainst ills; this the now destined bourne
> The immutable decree
> Thou set'st to life.

In Jeremiah the tones of hopefulness are heard ever and anon among the wails over national misfortune; the advent of the King of righteousness is celebrated immediately after the last notes of the funeral dirge over Jehoiachin have died away. So, too, "A voice is heard in Ramah, lamentations and bitter weeping; Rachel weeping for her children; she refuseth to be comforted for her children because they are not," but it is suddenly put to silence by another voice: "Thus said the Lord, Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears . . . for there is hope for thy latter end," etc. (xxxi. 15, 16). Like the great Italian singer in the *Divina Comedia* traversing the glooms of the Inferno and Purgatorio to reach the lofty heights of the Paradiso, the Hebrew poet in a kindred spirit, disturbed, too, like Dante, by the state of his native land, and distressed beyond measure, recovers from prostrate despondency, and, "making pearls of tears," sees the glimmer of hope in the utter darkness (xxix. 10 *seq.*). It may be too much to say, as Löhr does, in his comment on the third chapter of Lamentations, that here the dirge of mourning becomes a triumphal song of "ethical optimism," still it may be said with perfect truth that the writings of Jeremiah generally reflect a kind of mitigated pessimism, chastened by religious resignation and hopeful patience. It is this which differentiates the melancholy muse of Judea from the black,

cruel despondency of modern pessimistic poetry—he does not despair of his country.

From Jeremiah, the last of the prophet-statesmen and social reformers, we turn to Jeremiah, the preacher of righteousness, living in a degenerate age of religious stagnation and in "a period of moral criticism during which pessimism, as in our day, played its part." Like the Greek cynic in an excess of austere moroseness, with lantern in hand searching the streets of Athens for an honest man, Jeremiah scours the streets of Jerusalem in search of *a man* (chap. v. 1), despairing of success in finding manly fortitude among prophets, like Hananiah, fallen from the high ideal of their office, and in the prevailing epidemic of oracular utterances, prophesying falsely, thus giving support to the priests, who bear rule by their means ; looking in vain for a man among that seething multitude, the unreasoning crowd with its defective sense of morality more than satisfied with the low aims of its leaders in Church and State. "My people love to have it so." As an early supporter of the Deuteronomist reform, Jeremiah is disappointed by the barren results it yields in superficial observances of the letter of the law whilst violating its intrinsic principles. Jeremiah, attacking the Sopherim, as Socrates attacked the Sophists, lays bare the hollowness of their profession and sees the secret spring of moral degeneracy in the classes and the masses to be in the heart which he declares to be utterly deceitful and desperately wicked (chap. xvii, 9). Personal feeling adds a sting to his bitter criticism in facing a hostile crowd, headed by designing demagogues, so that with unmeasured complaints like Savonarola in the Duomo under similar circumstances, he launches forth in severe imprecations on the Holy City ; like him, too, he foresees and predicts the coming destruction, the helplessness and hopelessness of its deluded inhabitants arising from the consciousness of guilt (chap. xviii. 12). Here for a moment moral and religious

pessimism predominates, but only for a moment, The prophet recovers, and tender appeals to the people follow, urging them to return to their allegiance with a promise from Jehovah of national, consequent upon moral, regeneration. If we compare this with the eudaimonistic pessimism of von Hartmann, i.e. ancient Semitic with modern Arian pessimism, we find, no doubt, as the lapse of time should lead us to expect, a wider range of view in modern modes of thought and severer demands on human nature accordingly. For in Hartmann's system, where all intellectual and moral development culminates in the full conviction of the worthlessness of existence, and in which the cultivation of virtue leads up to a voluntary renunciation of life as the finale of the "world-process," the total aim of "cultured piety" consists in a noble effort to rid this unhappy universe of the curse of conscious being so as to enable it to relapse into the undisturbed calm of non-existence.

National self-preservation, not self-extinction, is that which the Hebrew thinker aims at. This may be a more narrow conception than that of the German pessimist, who also is a social and political reformer as well as an ethical philosopher whose patriotism, however, is made subordinate to cosmopolitian idealism. Hartmann's philosophical system is the outcome of a confluence of Oriental and Occidental ideals with an infusion of Christian sentiment and Hellenic speculation, it is transcendental, intangible and impracticable, and, moreover, logically inconsistent with the progressive spirit of the West. The directness of aim, resting on strong and simple faith in the continuity of life with a clinging to the facts of existence—existence, that is, regarded as a blessing in itself—individually and collectively and the anticipation of a final emerging of the creature from the bondage of corruption and the reconstruction of the theocracy constitutes the more practical view of Jeremiah, gaining in concentration

what it lacks in breadth. The "teleological optimism" of Hartmann ends in the sleep or dream of non-existence. It is this which differentiates Semitic from Arian, Hebrew from German pessimism. The former aims at amelioration, the latter at annihilation; both demand moral and religious reform, the one in order to ultimate reconstruction, the other in order to final destruction. As von Hartmann himself shows in his analytical history of religious philosophy the tragical-heroic melancholy and reflective tendency of the Germanic mind, as reflected in Teutonic myth, throw a veil of sadness over the brightness of the moment, so that it prefers to dwell regretfully on its evanescence rather than the possession of momentary bliss; hence its cheerful devotion even unto death, its willingness to sacrifice personal inclination to the painful performance of duty as the condition of a progressive realization of religious, ethical idealism. The heroic martyrdom of Jeremiah is of a different order. He is ready to live or die for his nation if in so doing he can restore its autonomy and cultus, the reign of justice and righteousness. Both in practical politics are patriotic, and both are religious thinkers and moralists with lofty aims. They differ, one being a weeping philosopher in theory whilst practically advancing national interests in a period of national development, the other a weeping prophet struggling in sorrow and suffering amid a national catastrophe. The one preaches a gospel of despair, as the corollary from the tenet that the Absolute is impersonal and impotent, to avoid final extinction; the other declares the message of hope since it holds fast on its belief in a personal and all-powerful Deity who can and will effect a final restitution.

If we compare Jeremiah's "sense of tears in mortal things" with the gloomy view of life and nature contained in "the venerable ancestral religions of mankind in the far

East," which so much attracted Schopenhauer, or even with the mystic pessimism of Christian saints in the West, its overstrained *contemptus mundi*; its constant refrain of "*sustine* and *abstine*"; its solemn allusions to the *Dies irae*,—the advent of the world's destruction, as the precursor of heavenly felicity, we cannot fail to note the greater sanity of the weeping philosopher, if so we may call him, of the Hebrews. The Semitic seriousness of Hebrew poetry has little, indeed, in common with the bright naturalism of Arabian literature before Mohammed, still less with Persian cheerfulness, though Omar Khayyam and Haphiz have their sad moods and melodies. But it has still less in common with the *Weltflucht* of Brahminism in its acosmic emanation theory of re-entrance into the eternal identity, the universal self of absolute existence, or the theory of esoteric Buddhism, which cuts the heart-strings of life in its attempts to attain the bliss of Nirvana. For the practical outcome of both is the concentration of all ethical effort in passive pity for the world's woes and resigned inaction, resting in patient waiting for the world's redemption in the hope of its final extinction and finding rest from weariness in the grave of humanity. This, as will be seen, corresponds with the philosophy of modern pessimism, with its tendency to passive pantheism, accepting the same sombre view of the utter illusiveness and worthlessness of life which in the subjective poetry of the day manifests a hopeless, helpless lassitude sometimes real, at other times affected. Thus Lenau, in his hypochondriacal melancholy, is ever "gravitating towards disaster," whilst Leconte de Lisle seeks refuge from the incurable ills of life in the rarefied atmosphere of poetic art, as the only consolation in a decadent age telling us to "expect nothing, and hope for nothing, unless it be the reward of nothingness." Even George Elliot, who refused to be called a pessimist and professed to be a meliorist in her strong faith in

in the possibilities of human progress, makes Fedalma say:

> There lies a grave
> Between this visionary present and the past.
> Our joy is dead, and only smiles on us,
> A loving shade from out the place of tombs.

All this is in complete contrast with the recurring strains of hopefulness in the Hebrew lyrics. Even the most "passionate plaints" of Jeremiah never reach the defiant tone of the pessimism of indignation, nor do the sorrows of Jeremiah approach anything like the self-commiserating larmoyant moanings of the modern lyrics of pessimism. Jewish theism sets a limit to despair, faith takes the place of fatalism. There may be a few isolated passages like this, "Can the Ethopian change his skin," etc., which tend in the direction of fatalistic despair. But in most instances the gloomy description of quiescent ease is followed by a brighter picture of future deliverance.

If, as is sometimes asserted, pessimism acts as a refining influence on heart and mind, curing the modern world of the vulgarity of sated optimism, there is here at least a point of contact between Old Testament pessimism and that of our own day. But the former is more balanced in avoiding the fallacy of extremes, neither overestimating earthly possessions with optimistic extravagance, nor yet turning away soured and embittered from the world of actualities with pessimistic moroseness. It uses the valley of tears as a well, life as a school of virtue, assigning to sorrow and suffering their proper disciplinary value. If "sufferance is the badge of all our race," as Shylock complains—a complaint fully justified by the anti-Semitic policy of modern Russia and Roumania—this at least has an ethical value in cultivating the sense of solidarity and unselfish benevolence, and strengthening the bonds of mutual sympathy among the members of the persecuted race, "pain," as a modern

Roman Catholic writer on the subject remarks, being "the true school of national sentiment."

In the same way, if we compare the sad realism of Jeremiah with the realistic materialism of modern fiction professing to give a "naturalistic" presentment of contemporary life, as in the case of Zola, Sudermann, and to some extent in Thomas Hardy, we observe the same contrast. They paint society in its naked ugliness and moral deformity, thus producing disgust at the base facts of life. With scientific method they attempt to trace all the evil propensities to inherit ancestral passions, or transmitted tendencies. They dwell with painful detail on "the dust and ashes of things," "the cruelty of lust and the fragility of love," the impotence of man in battling with the persistent forces of evil. But, as Joubert, speaking of the romances of his day, truly says:

> Misfortune to be beautiful and interesting must come from Heaven, or, at least, from above. Here it strikes from below, it comes from too near; the sufferers have it in their blood . . . tragedy paints misfortune, but of a fine tone and fibre, calamities of another age, and another world . . . here misfortune is present with us, it lasts for ever; it is made of iron rudely wrought; it strikes horror. Catastrophe is all very well; but nobody likes to hear of torture . . . in spite of all the fine qualities that are labelled and paraded before us it is most true to say that we are looking rather at vulgar people than melancholy events.

Not so in the picture of social corruption given in the writings of Jeremiah. Here gleams of light relieve the gloomy picture, out of the grave of buried greatness rise new national aspirations. Here the prophet, as the precursor of Zionism, sees the Jewish state rise out of the ruins on which he sat weeping, inspired by a full assurance of a coming social regeneration. "Between sorrow and joy the difference is but as between a gladsome, enlightened acceptance of life and a hostile, gloomy submission, between a large and harmonious conception of life, and one that is

stubborn and narrow," says Maeterlinck in *Wisdom and Destiny*, "it is only the lofty idea, the untiring, courageous, human idea that separates gladness from sorrow."

As a human document, depicting his own trials, and as the representative of his race describing those of his people, Jeremiah maintains the higher standpoint here indicated by the modern poet-thinker. In the third chapter of Lamentations, where the individual speaks in the name of the nation personified, he not only describes its sufferings as the consequence of national sins, but also its final recovery, thus giving voice to the mourning of the pilgrims at the wailing-wall of the ruined temple, and yet at the same time filling their hearts with patient hope. "It is good that a man should hope and quietly wait for the salvation of the Lord."

M. KAUFMANN.

THE LIFE OF CHRIST ACCORDING TO ST. MARK.[1]

XVIII. Teaching by Parables, IV. 1–34.

The previous sections of the Gospel have been concerned with the gifts, the character, the work of Jesus, rather than His teaching. We have been told that His marvellous powers of healing drew crowds after Him everywhere, and that His discourses were so remarkable that the people listened even when He did not work miracles. His influence in Galilee had become a source of anxiety to the supporters of the government. Something, indeed, has been partly stated, partly implied as to His teaching; He had announced the imminence of a new dispensation, the Kingdom of God, but we have been told nothing as to the nature of the kingdom. We have, however, learnt that His teaching was ethical, a demand for repentance accompanied by a promise of forgiveness. Moreover He had repudiated the current idea that external ceremonial observances were amongst the essentials of religion; and He had been compelled to break with the representatives of popular orthodoxy, the scribes and Pharisees, and even with His own family.

St. Mark now devotes a short section to some of the more remarkable sayings of Jesus as to the coming—not the nature—of the Kingdom. They were not all uttered on the same occasion, but they belong to what may be called the second stage of the early ministry of Jesus by the Lake of Galilee near Capernaum. He was still a popular idol; great multitudes pressed upon Him so closely that

[1] These studies do not profess to be an adequate historical and doctrinal account of Christ, but are an attempt to set forth the impression which St. Mark's account of our Lord would make on a reader whose only source of information was the Second Gospel, and who knew nothing of Christian dogmatics.

He was obliged to speak from a boat moored at a little distance from the shore.

At this time Jesus adopted a method of teaching by parables, figurative sayings or stories with a moral; but to His public audiences He told only the stories and reserved the morals for the disciples. "He did not speak to them without a parable, but in private He explained everything to His own disciples." Amongst other things He explained why He used this method: "It is given to you to know the secret truth concerning the Kingdom of God, but to those without it is all set forth in parables, that 'seeing they may see and not perceive, and hearing they may hear and not understand, lest at any time they should turn and be forgiven.'" This reserve indicates a revulsion from the spontaneous enthusiasm of Jesus' first preaching. How quickly it came about we do not know, for the brevity of St. Mark creates an impression of rapid movement which is partly illusory; but probably a few weeks showed that the preaching of the Kingdom to the people was a failure. The audiences which crowded round Jesus were not seriously affected. They came as the Jews of old to Ezekiel because Jesus was "unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well on an instrument," and there was the added attraction that they might possibly witness a miracle. But there was no moral or spiritual reformation in Galilee; these crowds were not the advance guard of the Kingdom in its victorious coming. He was not encouraged in any way by this empty popularity, and His hopes turned to the inner circle of intimate disciples, so that the public ministry became a means of enlisting an occasional recruit, and His main work not so much preaching, but the training of preachers.

Hence, He Himself spoke in parables. The ancient East, even more than modern England, loved to take—or leave—its instruction in the form of proverb, apologue,

fable, allegory, or anecdote, and no doubt this new feature in the teaching of Jesus added to His popularlty, while the anger of the Pharisees would be touched with contempt when they saw the arch-heretic assume the character of professional story-teller. But to us it seems that the transparent and suggestive figures used in the parables would attract thoughtful, serious, and inquiring minds, and thus win for Jesus the kind of disciples He desired, while the careless crowd were merely amused. But the Gospel does not thus explain the use of this method. According to St. Mark, Jesus declared that He spoke in parables in order that His hearers might neither understand His meaning nor profit byHis teaching. The Evangelist, in his matter-of-fact way, reports this saying without comment, and the record does not suggest any complete explanation, although various helpful ideas would occur to a sympathetic reader. In the first place, the saying is a quotation, probably current in some conventional sense, familiar to Jesus, to His hearers, and to St. Mark, but quite unknown to us. Again, men use quotations for the sake of some one point bearing on the subject with which they are dealing, and cite the rest of a quotation merely for the sake of completeness, and without intending to apply all its literal meaning to present circumstances. Some help, too, is given by the parable of the Sower. Direct personal appeal to a miscellaneous audience, sowing on high roads, in thickets, and on thin layers of soil that half hid the underlying rock, secured numerous adherents, who might even obtain the experience of forgiveness. But, for the most part, such converts soon lapsed; some became openly indifferent, while others injured the cause more deeply by continuing to be partisans when they had ceased to be disciples. Those who had passed through such an experience and fallen back to their old level, were further from the kingdom than they had been before. "For as touching those who were once enlightened

and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost and tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the age to come, and then fell away, it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance." Hence, the wise husbandmen would only sow in good ground which had been prepared for the seed; the teaching in parables was a form of preparation in which the spiritual significance of the message was mercifully veiled from those to whom it would have been "a savour of death unto death."

The parables of this section, the Sower, the City on a Hill, the Lamp and the Bushel, the Seed Growing Secretly, and the Mustard Seed, reveal the mind of Jesus as to His early ministry and the future of the Kingdom. In the Sower He recognizes without bitterness or discouragement the comparative failure of indiscriminate preaching.

There had, indeed, been a measure of success, good ground which brought forth abundantly; but the figure of sowing used in three of these parables implies the limited usefulness of public preaching; sowing is only effectual on certain soils under certain conditions, usually after careful and laborious preparation, and at the right season. Often the germination of the seed is only a beginning, which speedily comes to a disastrous end. The parable of the Seed Growing Secretly recognizes that in the Kingdom, as in farming, human agency can effect little; the preacher may sow, but he must leave the result to the working of heavenly powers upon the heart, and must allow such working its appointed time.

These parables also show how the hopes of Jesus centred in the inner circle of disciples. From them the Kingdom would grow; the seed in the good ground would multiply a hundredfold; the mustard seed would become a great tree. So far the real beginnings of the Kingdom were very small, but they were the earnest of a great future. Indeed, in

spite of difficulties and delays, the Kingdom was so real and present to Jesus, that He already foresaw the troubles which would follow its establishment. In the parable of the Sower, the birds of the air snatch up the seed from the wayside; but they lodge in the branches of the tree sprung from the mustard seed. When the powers of evil had failed to destroy the Kingdom, they would find an entrance into it, and fight against it from within. Obviously, an intimate acquaintance with the Twelve must have shown that the Kingdom, of which they were to be the heralds, could not be without blemish—Judas Iscariot was one of the number.

Some aphorisms recorded with the parables may have originated in His sense of the failings of His followers, and in His anxiety that the chosen few should rise to their opportunity and responsibility. "Take head how ye hear; with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you, and more shall be given unto you."

The parable of the Lamp and the Bushel implies that the private teaching to the disciples would not always be esoteric; Jesus was kindling, keeping alive, and cherishing a light which, at the right time, would be put on a stand and shine through the whole house. "There is nothing hid but that it may be manifested, or made secret, but that it may come to light." The truth that for a moment was a secret between Jesus and His disciples, would one day be proclaimed throughout the world.

XIX. The Stilling of the Storm, IV. 35–41.

Up to this point it has been possible to trace a certain progress in the narrative, in the revelation of the character of Jesus, and in the development of His work; now we have a series of incidents in which St. Mark's intention is to illustrate the greatness of His miraculous gifts by

instances surpassing any yet hitherto recorded. The first of these is the Stilling of the Storm.

At the close, as it seems, of a long day's teaching, from a boat moored at a little distance from the land, Jesus did not land on the western coast and go home to Capernaum; He was too tired to run the gauntlet of the curious crowd with its importunity for miracles and deeds of healing; and He bade the disciples take Him across to the other side. The little voyage was a sudden inspiration; no preparation had been made for it, and they took Him just as He was. Tired out He lay down on a cushion in the stern and fell fast asleep.

All at once the lake was swept by one of those sudden storms which are common on inland waters surrounded by hills; the waves beat over the boat, and it seemed as if it must sink; but Jesus still slumbered in utter weariness; and the disciples forgot Him, absorbed in their labour and their danger. At last they could do no more, and their thoughts turned to their Master. The whole Kingdom of God, the answer to the prayers of many generations, the fulfilment of the promises of God, the hope for the future of the world, was on board that fishing smack; and the boat might be swamped at any moment. But the disciples were simply concerned for their own lives—what is the Kingdom of God to drowning men? They were irritated by the contrast between their own terrified excitement, and the serene repose of Jesus; they roused Him with a petulant, "Master, carest Thou not that we perish?" He woke no doubt to the vague confusion that follows the sudden termination of deep sleep; the wild scene broke upon Him; the tumult of winds and waves, the pitching and rolling of the boat, the incoherent cries of His disciples; but in a moment He was Master of Himself and His circumstances. "He arose and rebuked the wind, and said unto the sea, Peace, be still: And the wind ceased, and there was a great

calm." To Him, with His imperturbable serenity in the face of such troubles, the terror of the disciples seemed strange. "Why," said He, "are ye so fearful? How is it that you have so little faith?"

XX. The Demoniac among the Tombs, V. 1–20.

We next read how Jesus landed in the district east of the lake, and met a demoniac among the tombs, and cast out devils from him. Like other demoniacs, the man saluted Him as the Messiah, the Son of God Most High. The incident is narrated on account of some special features; it was a signal victory over the powers of evil because the man was possessed by a legion—or, as we should say, by a whole army—of demons; and their presence, number, and malignity were shown by their passing from the man into a herd of swine, which forthwith ran headlong over a precipice into the lake, and were drowned. The chief result was that the people of the district were alarmed at the loss of their property, and induced Jesus to leave their country at once, so that the miracle prevented Him from preaching the Kingdom there. Hence Jesus departed from His usual practice, and, instead of bidding the sometime demoniac be silent about his experience, He bade him go home and tell his friends what the Lord had done for him.

The population of this eastern district was largely Gentile, and the readiness with which Jesus departed may be an indication that He felt no call to preach to any but Jews. Perhaps, indeed, He had simply sought solitude there and rest from active ministry; and if so, the incident did not affect His work.

It is doubtful whether the reader whose impressions we are trying to realize would have thought it necessary to discuss the morality of our Lord's conduct—at any rate St. Mark had no misgivings. There was, indeed, a wholesale destruction of other people's property without compensa-

tion or apology; but this would seem to the reader the result of an unforeseen accident; who could calculate, or be responsible for, the vagaries of an army of demons expelled from their chosen habitation?

XXI. Jairus' Daughter and the Woman with the Issue, V. 21–43.

We come next to two incidents, the Raising of Jairus' Daughter, and the Healing of the Woman with the Issue, which are so closely combined that they must be considered together.

When Jesus again reached the western shore of the Lake, He was met by the usual crowd. On this occasion they were escorting, so to speak, a ruler of a synagogue, probably at Capernaum—a man of some position, corresponding roughly to a deacon or churchwarden. His twelve-year old daughter lay dying, and he begged Jesus to save her. Jesus went with him, and the crowd followed and thronged Him.

In the confusion another sufferer found her opportunity. A woman had suffered for many years from an obstinate ailment, an issue of blood, which had defied such skill as the doctors of the time possessed. She had absolute faith in Jesus, but in her modesty and diffidence she had shrunk from obtruding herself upon His notice. Now it seemed that she could snatch a blessing unperceived. She made her way through the crowd and touched His robe; at once she felt that she was healed and tried to escape as unnoticed as she had come.

But there was an abrupt pause in the movement of the crowd; Jesus had stopped and turned round, and was looking with searching eyes on those about Him. As He turned, He spoke with a certain sharpness inspired by a new and startling experience; "Who touched my clothes?" The words seemed to the woman to be charged with stern reproof, and her retreat was arrested. A moment's respite

was afforded her by the disciples' answer to their Master's question, "Thou seest the crowd pressing on Thee and sayest, Who touched me?" But Jesus took no notice. He had felt a touch that drew power from Him, as no touch had ever done before, and His eyes still sought to discover who had done it. They seemed to the woman to single her out, and, frightened and trembling, she came and fell at His feet and told Him all the truth, fearing perhaps that she might lose the stolen blessing. But He comforted her with gracious words, "Daughter, thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace, and be healed of thy plague."

As He spoke, messengers from the ruler's house made their way through the crowd to where their master stood by the side of Jesus, impatient at the delay that was wasting precious moments.

"Thy daughter," they said, "is dead; it is no use troubling the Teacher."

Jesus' reputation as a worker of miracles was limited; no one supposed that He could raise the dead. Jesus, however, heard the message, and bade the ruler "Fear not, only believe." The ruler had seen what faith had done for the woman, let him imitate her. In order to appreciate our Lord's quiet confidence at this crisis we must remember that He had already spent a measure of His healing power upon the woman with the issue, and that He went straight from her to Jairus' daughter. He did what He could to collect His forces. Just before, in His patient, tolerant, simple kindliness, He had permitted the crowd to hustle and jostle Him; now He asserted His authority and dismissed the thronging multitude and even the majority of the Apostles. Only three were allowed to accompany Him, Peter, James, and John, three out of the four fishermen whom He called first of all; He was fain to strengthen Himself by the sympathy of His dearest friends.

When they reached the house, the ceremonies consequent

on a death had begun; and the air was filled with clamour, wailing, and shrieking. Jesus surveyed the scene for a while, and then entered the inner court where the mourners were assembled. His entrance there was a momentary lull in the tempest of lamentation, and the mourners looked curiously at the miraculous Healer who had come too late. What had He come for? He was going to speak. What would He have to say?

"Why," said He, "do you clamour and wail? The child did not die; she is only asleep."

They burst out into peals of laughter; but He bade them go, and they obeyed. Then He took with Him the father and mother and the three disciples; and went into the room where the child lay, and took her by the hand, and said, "Damsel, rise." At once she got up, and began to move about the room—probably she went straight to her mother. The little group of spectators were carried out of themselves by the tide of overwhelming emotions. When they recovered, the first impulse of some of them was to rush out and spread the wonderful news; but Jesus checked them, and bade them tell no one. Then, with that absolute self-possession which He had maintained since He had heard the news of the child's supposed death, He told them to give her some food.

There are a few points which must be considered at rather more length. We have referred to the self-possession of Jesus. Our narrative constantly shows that one chief feature of the memories which the early Church cherished concerning Him was His perfect calmness in the most exciting circumstances. He was not startled when He woke in the boat, and found Himself face to face with death; He was not daunted when it seemed as if the task set Him was not merely to heal the sick but to raise the dead. Moreover, He did not seek to call forth His mysterious powers by any exciting stimulant such as music, or ecstatic

ritual, or an expectant crowd; but He sought strength in quietness and self-recollection, and the mute sympathy of friends. When He triumphed over disease and demons there was no sign of exultation. Yet sometimes He was stirred by what would seem a matter of course to ordinary men, as for instance by the cold-blooded cruelty of fanatics. Again He was sensitive to influences which did not affect others. In this incident he distinguished the woman's timid touch amid the pressure of the jostling crowd, as a mother, even in her sleep, singles out her infant's feeble cry from a babel of loud noises. There was, so to speak, an emotional circuit set up between Him and her, so that He felt the shock of her importunate demand for healing and the immediate drain upon His mysterious forces. By such an experience even He was startled.

Another point is the contradiction between the words of Jesus and the statements of the household of Jairus. According to them the girl actually died; Jesus however said that she did not die but was sleeping.[1] We may assume that in such a conflict of authority St. Mark intends his readers to accept the view taken by Jesus. How then did Jesus know that she was not dead? Had He questioned the messengers, and drawn His conclusion from the further details He elicited; or has St. Mark omitted to tell us that Jesus had already seen the child before He checked the mourners. Either view is possible, but the following is a more probable explanation. He had set out for Jairus' house in the assured conviction that He was going to heal the child; the news of her death seemed incredible because He was not conscious of any power or commission to raise the dead. So that if they were right, His conviction that He was going to heal the child was a mistake. That was impossible, therefore He knew that she

[1] The view that Jesus spoke figuratively, meaning that though the girl actually died, she was not permanently dead, but would soon be resuscitated, seems improbable if not impossible.

was not dead. This view may have been confirmed to Him by some mysterious intuition, such as that by which He was made aware of the woman's touch and its meaning.

Another problem is involved in the command to the girl's friends to tell no one. It was probably called forth by the special circumstances of the moment, but this can hardly be all. The words as they stand would have a general application, as in other passages. Yet the command seems futile. The child's supposed death was generally known; the public lamentation had begun; and it would have been impossible to conceal the fact that she was alive. Some explanation may perhaps be found in the misunderstanding as to the supposed death. The household would cling to the belief that the girl actually died; and the popular form of the story would be that Jesus had raised her from the dead. Thus Jesus' reputation as a wonder-worker would be still further enhanced, and His work hindered; but the excitement might be somewhat checked if Jairus and his family refused to talk about the matter.

One more point before we pass on. The popular tradition would certainly be that Jesus had restored a dead girl to life. If, therefore, St. Mark had had no better authority than popular tradition, he would have made it clear that Jairus' daughter actually died, and would have left no loophole for doubt. St. Mark's reserve and accuracy on this point can only be due to the testimony of an eye-witness; that is to say, the Evangelist was acquainted, directly or indirectly, with an account of the incident given by one of the three Apostles.

XXII. The Visit to Nazareth, VI. 1–6.

In spite of the precaution taken by Jesus, the mighty works discussed in the last section must have encouraged the people to resort to Him, and have stimulated their importunity. Now, therefore, Jesus withdrew from the district,

and at last turned His steps homeward to Nazareth. No doubt the Nazarenes had heard from time to time of the doings of their fellow townsman ; of His eloquence and His miracles—and also of His heresy ; His contempt for the law ; His lax life ;[1] His neglect of the Sabbath ; His flouting of constituted authorities, holy and learned men like the scribes ; and the bad company He kept, how He went about the country with a disreputable rabble at His heels, tax-gatherers, sinners, and such folk. There must have been Nazarene sympathisers with the Pharisees who told many scandalous tales about Jesus. The last thing that was known for certain about Him was that His family were convinced that He was mad, and had set out for Capernaum in order to place Him under restraint. The townspeople may have heard how He had quarrelled with His family, and had disowned them.

Now, however, He and His disciples appeared at Nazareth ; and people could see for themselves that one at any rate of the charges against Him was true, He certainly had a tax-gatherer for one of His chosen disciples. We are not told how He spent His time till the Sabbath ; but when the Day of Rest came, He went, according to His custom, to the Synagogue, and began to teach. For a time the people listened, they were even impressed ; but soon there arose a hostile murmur. What right had this man to speak with an air of wisdom and authority? Who was He that people should credit Him with working miracles? He was only a carpenter, a member of a poor family known to them all. The murmur grew till it became impossible for Jesus to continue His teaching. He uttered a brief emphatic protest, "A prophet is not without honour except in his own town, and amongst his own kinsfolk, and his own family" ; and then sat down, or more probably turned and left the synagogue. Soon after He left the town.

[1] As the Pharisees would consider it to be

In the interval, before He departed, He healed a few sick folk. St. Mark tells us that, with these exceptions, "He could there do no mighty work." Not indeed that He tried and failed, but partly because His fellow townsmen did not believe in His powers of healing—"He marvelled at their unbelief"; and partly because He did not feel the spiritual impulse which moved Him to undertake "mighty works," and assured Him of power to perform them.

The rebuff at Nazareth was the third stage in the failure of the preaching of the Kingdom. Jesus had failed to gain the Pharisees, and had thus provoked the hostility of the only living religious force amongst the Jews. His appeal to the people generally had been powerless to effect any widespread moral and spiritual reformation. But, hitherto, in spite of the interruptions of demoniacs, and the criticism of the Pharisees, He had shown Himself master of any audience He addressed. Now, however, in His native town, amongst His kinsfolk, His old playmates and acquaintances, He could not command a hearing.

Probably the episode did not affect His public reputation, but it must have been a profound discouragement to Jesus. Rejection by His own family and townsfolk might well seem an omen of rejection by His own people, Israel; the Shadow of the Cross was already falling across His path. Moreover, the incident was a new revelation of the hardness of men's hearts, and Jesus was astonished at their unbelief. The astonishment of Jesus marks Him out as a stranger on the earth, a visitant from some higher, purer, and nobler world. He is surprised at what we take for granted, the harshness, selfishness, and suspicion which we call human nature.

When He left Nazareth, He did not return to Capernaum, or to the shores of the Lake, but carried His message to the neighbouring villages. Thus the imminent coming of the Kingdom was preached in a new district.

W. H. Bennett.

CHARACTERISTICS OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

II

It will be necessary to deal more minutely with the two classes of Semitisms which the negative evidence of the papyri may compel us to recognize provisionally in the Greek New Testament. But for the present we may be content with the general thesis that the Greek Bible is written in the common Greek vernacular, modified throughout the Old Testament and some parts of the New by conditions which are abundantly paralleled in the literal translations of the English Bible. It is time now to pass on to the description of Hellenistic Greek, apart from its special use in the Bible. But before leaving the subject I should like to mention two or three examples of the bearing of this grammatical study upon literary criticism.

In dealing with the New Testament constructions with *ἐγένετο* in the note appended to my last paper, I had occasion to record that this notable Hebraism was in the New Testament almost confined to the writings of the Gentile Luke.[1] It does not of course stand alone. There is an instructive little point in Luke's report of the preaching of John the Baptist. In iii. 8, he has *καὶ μὴ ἄρξησθε λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς*. Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 27, shows that in narrative "the Palestinian-Jewish literature uses the meaningless 'he began,'" a conventional locution which was evidently parallel with our Middle-English auxiliary *gan*. It is very common in the Synoptists, and occurs twice as often in Luke as in Matthew. Dalman

[1] My suggestion (p. 75) that the construction of *ἐγένετο* with infin. was Luke's own coinage is dispensed with by two papyrus quotations which I noticed too late to include. In *Papyrus Cattaoui*, a Roman-named soldier says *ἄρτι ἐὰν γένηταί με ἀποδημεῖν*; and in *B.U.* 970 we find *ἐὰν γένηται μὴ εὐτονῆσαι αὐτόν*. They are both dated 2nd cent. A.D. I fully except that I have overlooked other examples.

thinks that if this Aramaic שָׁרִי with participle had become practically meaningless, we might well find the same use in direct speech, though no example happens to be known. Now in the otherwise verbal identical verse Matt. iii. 9 we find *δόξητε* for *ἄρξησθε*, "do not presume to say," which is thoroughly idiomatic Greek, and manifestly a deliberate improvement of an original preserved more exactly by Luke. It seems to follow that this original was a Greek translation of the Aramaic logia-document, used in common by both Evangelists, but with greater freedom by the first. If Luke was ignorant of Aramaic, he would be led by his keen desire for accuracy to incorporate with a minimum of change translations he was able to secure, even when they were executed by men whose Greek was not very idiomatic. But *ne sutor ultra crepidam*: these things belong to the higher critics and not to the mere grammarian. I must, however, venture to hammer on their last a little longer. The grammarian necessarily claims his say on the Johannine problem. We saw above (EXPOSITOR, January, p. 71), that the author of the Apocalypse writes as a man whose Greek education was not yet complete: like many of the farmers of Egypt, he did not know the rules of concord for gender and case. If then his date is to be 95 A.D., he cannot have written the fourth Gospel only a short time after. Either, therefore, we must take the earlier date for the Apocalypse, which would allow the Apostle to improve his Greek by constant use in a city like Ephesus where his Aramaic would be useless; or we must suppose that the authors of John xxi. 24 mended his grammar for him throughout the Gospel. Otherwise, we must join the ranks of the *Χωρίζοντες*.[1] Here, of course, I am only putting the question, leaving it to the experts to solve it.

Finally, as a transition to the next subject, let me note

[1] May I, in passing, express the malicious satisfaction which a grammarian feels in reading the words of a very cocksure critic, Prof. B. W. Bacon, in the current *Hibbert Journal* (p. 345)? "Jesus 'is

one or two suggestions by the great modern Greek scholar, Albert Thumb, who has used dialectic differences in the language of to-day in a way which promises to repay further research. In an article in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1903, p. 421, he calls attention to the prominence of ἐμός, etc., in the fourth Gospel, as against μου, etc., elsewhere. [Ἐμός occurs thirty-six times in John, once in 3 John, once in Apocalypse, and thirty-four times in the rest of the New Testament. I am bound to admit that the argument is not strengthened by the figures for σός, ἡμέτερος and ὑμέτερος], which between them occur 11 times in John (Gospel and Epistles), 12 times in Luke's two books, and 21 times in the rest of the New Testament.] He tells us that ἐμός and the rest survive in modern Pontic-Cappadocian Greek, while the genitive has replaced them elsewhere. The inference is that the Fourth Gospel comes from Asia Minor. I might add that on the same showing Luke has his Macedonian origin encouraged, for he hardly uses ἐμός; and the Apocalypse, which has only one occurrence between the four possessives, suits a recent immigrant very well. In the same paper Thumb shows that the infinitive still survives in Pontic, while in Greece proper it yields entirely to the periphrasis. Now the syntactical conditions under which the infinitive is still found in Pontic answer very well to those which appear in the New Testament, in uses where western Greek tended to enlarge the use of ἵνα. Obviously this tells us little more than that the New Testament has eastern provenance, which no one is likely to deny. But the principle will be found useful later.

We proceed to examine the nature and history of the vernacular Greek itself. It is a study which has almost come into existence in the present generation. Classical scholars have studied the Hellenistic literature for the sake

raised'—ἐγείρεται—not 'rises'—ἀνίστησι (*sic* !!)—from the dead" [in John xxi]. If John's grammar was equal to this, the work of the Ephesian revisers was no sinecure.

of its matter: its language was never considered worth noticing, except to chronicle contemptuously its deviations from "good Greek." There perhaps the authors were only receiving the treatment they courted, for to write Attic was the object of them all, pursued doubtless with varying degrees of zeal, but in all cases removing them far from the language they used in daily life. The study of the vernacular itself was not possible, for the Biblical Greek was interpreted on lines of its own, and the papyri were mostly reposing in the Egyptian tombs, the small collections that were published receiving but little attention. And equally unknown was the scientific study of modern Greek. To this day, even great philologists like Hatzidakis decry as a mere patois, utterly unfit for literary use, the living language upon whose history they have spent their lives. The translation of the Gospels into the Greek which descends directly from their original idiom is treated as sacrilege by the devotees of a "literary" dialect which no one ever spoke. It is left to foreign students to recognize the value of Pallis' version to those who would study the original in the light of the continuous development of the language from the age of Alexander to our own time.

As has been hinted in the preceding paragraph, the source of our present-day study of New Testament Greek are threefold:—(1) the prose literature of the post-classical period, from Polybius down through the Byzantine age; (2) the *Κοινή* inscriptions, and the Egyptian non-literary papyri; (3) modern vernacular Greek, with especial reference to its dialectic variations, so far as these are at present registered. Before we discuss the part which each of these must play in our investigations, it will be necessary to ask what was the *Κοινή* and how it arose.

The history, geography and ethnology of Hellas are jointly responsible for the remarkable phenomena which even the literature of the classical period presents. The very school-

boy in his first two or three years at Greek has to realize that "Greek" is anything but a unity. He has not thumbed the *Anabasis* long before the merciful pedagogue takes him on to Homer, and his painfully acquired irregular verbs demand a great extension of their limits. When he develops into a Tripos candidate he knows well that Homer, Pindar, Sappho, Herodotus and Aristotle are all of them in their own several ways defiant of the Attic grammar to which his own composition must conform. And if his studies ultimately invade the dialect inscriptions, he finds in Elis and Heraclea, Lacedaemon and Thebes, Crete and Cyprus, forms of Greek for which his literature has almost entirely failed to prepare him. And the Theban who said *Ϝίττω Δεύς* and the Athenian who said *ἴστω Ζεύς* lived in towns exactly as far apart as Liverpool and Manchester! The bewildering variety of dialects within that little country arises partly from racial differences. Upon the primitive "Pelasgians," represented best by the Athenians of history, swept first from Northen Europe[1] the hordes of Homer's Achæans, and then, in post-Homeric days, the Dorian invaders. Dialectic conditions were as inevitably complex as they were in our own country a thousand years ago, when successive waves of Germanic invaders, of different races and dialects, had settled in the several parts of an island in which a Keltic population still maintained itself to greater or less extent. Had the Norman Conquest come before the Saxon, which determined the language of the country, the parallel would have been singularly complete. The conditions which in England were largely supplied by distance were supplied in Greece by the mountain barriers which so effectively cut off each little State from regular communication with its neighbours—an effect and a cause at once of the passion for

[1] I am assuming as proved the thesis of Professor Ridgeway, in his *Early Age of Greece*, which seems to me a key that will unlock many of the problems of Greek history, religion and language. Of course *adhuc sub iudice lis est.*

autonomy which made of Hellas a heptarchy of heptarchies.

Meanwhile a steady process was going on which determined finally the character of literary Greek. Sparta might win the hegemony of Greece at Aegospotami, and Thebes wrest it from them at Leuktra; but Sparta could not produce a man of letters, and Pindar, the lonely "Theban eagle," knew better than to try poetic flights in Bœotian. The intellectual supremacy of Athens was beyond challenge long before the political unification of Greece was accomplished; and Attic was firmly established as the only possible dialect for prose composition. The post-classical writers wrote Attic according to their lights, tempered generally with a plentiful admixture of grammatical and lexical elements drawn from the vernacular. Strenuous efforts were made by precisians to improve the Attic quality of this artificial literary dialect; and we still possess the works of Atticists who cry out against the "bad Greek" and "solecisms" of their contemporaries, thus incidentally providing us with information concerning a Greek which interests us more than the artificial Attic they prized so highly. All their scrupulousness did not however prevent their deviating from Attic in matters more important than vocabulary. The optative in Lucian is perpetually misused, and no Atticist successfully attempts to reproduce the ancient use of *οὐ* and *μή* with the participle. Those writers who are less particular in their purism write in a literary *Κοινή* which admits without difficulty many features of various origin, while generally recalling Attic. No doubt the influence of Thucydides encouraged this freedom. The true Attic, as spoken by educated people in Athens, was hardly used in literature before the fourth century.[1] the Ionic dialect having large influence on the, to some extent, artificial idiom, which the older writers at Athens used. It

[1] Schwyzer, *Die Weltsprachen des Altertums*, p. 15 n., cites as the earliest extant prose monument of genuine Attic in literature the pseudo-Xenophon's *De republica Atheniensi*, which dates from before 413 B.C.

was not strange therefore that the standard for most of the post-classical writers should go back, for instance, to the πράσσω of Thucydides rather than the πράττω of Plato and Demosthenes.

Such, then, was the "Common Greek" of literature, from which we have still to derive our illustrations for the New Testament to a very large extent. Any lexicon will show how important for our purpose is the vocabulary of the *Κοινή* writers from Polybius down. And even the most rigid Atticists found themselves unable to avoid words and usages which Plato would not have recognized. But side by side with this was a fondness for obsolete words with literary associations. Take *ναῦς*, for example, which is freely found in Aelian, Josephus, and other *Κοινή* writers. It does not appear in the indices of eight volumes of Grenfell and Hunt's papyri—except where literary fragments come in—nor in those to vol. iii. of the Berlin collection and the small volume from Chicago. (I am naming all the collections that I happen to have by me.) We turn to the New Testament, and find it once, in Luke's shipwreck narrative, in a phrase which Blass (*Philology of the Gospels*, p. 186), suspected to be a reminiscence of Homer. In style and syntax the literary Common Greek diverges more widely from the colloquial. The bearing of all this on the subject of our study will come out frequently in the course of our investigation. Here it will suffice to refer to Blass's *Grammar*, p. 5, for an interesting summary of phenomena which are practically restricted to Harnack's Priscilla, and to parts of Luke and Paul,[1] where sundry logical and grammatical elements from the literary dialect invade the colloquial style which is elsewhere universal in the New Testament.

[1] In quoting Blass here I should not like to accept too unreservedly his opinion that Luke, in Acts xx. 29, *misused* the literary word ἄφιξις. The suggestion that Paul meant "after my *arrival*, home-coming," while not without difficulty, at least deserves considering.

The writers who figure in Dr. W. Schmid's well-known book, *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus*, were not the last to found a literary language on the artificial resuscitation of the ancient Attic. Essentially the same thing is being tried to-day. The "mummy-language," as Krumbacher calls it, will not stand the test of use in poetry, but in prose literature, in newspapers, and in Biblical translation it has the dominion, which is vindicated by Athenian undergraduates, with bloodshed if need be.[1] We have nothing to do with this curious phenomenon, except to warn students that before citing modern Greek in illustration of the New Testament they must make sure whether their source is *καθαρεύουσα* or *καθομιλουμένη*, book Greek or spoken Greek. The former may of course have borrowed from ancient or modern sources—for it is a medley far more mixed than we should get by compounding together Cynewulf and Kipling—the particular feature for which it is cited. But it obviously cannot stand in any line of historical development, and it is just as valuable as Volapük to the student of linguistic evolution. The popular patois, on the other hand, is a living language, and we shall soon see that it takes a very important part in the discussions on which we are entering.

We pass on then to the spoken dialect of the first century Hellenists, its history and its peculiarities. Our sources are, in order of importance, (1) non-literary papyri, (2) inscriptions, (3) modern vernacular Greek. The literary sources are almost confined to the Biblical Greek. A few general words may be said on these sources before we examine the origin of the Greek which they embody.

[1] See Krumbacher's vigorous polemic, *Das Problem d. neugr. Schriftsprache* summarized by the present writer in *Expository Times*, 1903, p. 550 ff. Professor Hatzidakis replies with equal energy in *Rev. des Études grecques*, 1903, p. 210 ff.

The papyri have one very obvious disadvantage in that, with the not very important exception of Herculaneum, their provenance is limited to one country, Egypt. We shall see, however, that the disadvantage does not practically count. They date from the third century B.C. to the seventh A.D. The monuments of the earliest period are fairly abundant, and they give us specimens of the spoken *Κοινή* from a time when the dialect was still a novelty. The papyri are not of course to be treated as a unity. Those which alone concern us are simply the waste paper of Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt, and their style has the same degree of unity as we should see in the sacks of waste paper brought to an English paper-mill from a solicitor's office, a farm, a school, a shop, a manse, and a house in Downing Street. Each contribution has to be considered separately. Old wills, law reports, contracts, census returns, marriage settlements, receipts, and official orders largely ran along stereotyped lines; and as formulæ tend to be permanent we have a degree of conservatism in the language which is not seen in documents which are free from these trammels. Petitions contain this element in greater or less extent, but naturally show more freedom in the recitation of the particular grievances for which redress is claimed. Private letters are our most valuable sources, and are of course all the better for the immense differences that show themselves in the education of their writers. The well worn epistolary formulæ show variety mostly in their spelling, and their value for the student lies primarily in their remarkable resemblances to the conventional phraseology which even the letter-writers of the New Testament were content to use. The part of the letter which contains the point is perhaps most instructive when its grammar is weakest, for it shows which way the language was tending. Few papyri are more suggestive than the letter of the lower-schoolboy to his father (*O.P.* 119, second

or third century), already referred to in my papers here more than once. It would have surprised paterfamilias, when he applied the well merited cane, to learn that seventeen centuries afterwards there would be scholars who would count that audacious missive greater treasure than a new fragment of Sappho! But this is by the way. It must not be inferred from this laudation of the ungrammatical papyri that the N.T. writers are at all comparable in lack of education. The indifference to concord which we noted in the Apocalypse is almost isolated in this connexion. But the illiterates show us by their exaggerations the tendencies which the better schooled writers keep in restraint. With writings from farmers and from Emperors, and every class between, we can form a kind of "grammatometer" by which to estimate how the language stands in the development of any particular use we may wish to investigate.

Inscriptions come second to papyri mainly because their very material shows that they were meant to last. The Greek may not be of the purest, but such as it is we see it in its best clothes, while that of the papyri is in corduroys. The special value of the common Greek inscriptions lies in their corroborating the papyri, and practically showing that there was but little dialectic difference between the Greek of Egypt and Asia Minor, Italy and Syria. There would probably be varieties of pronunciation, and we have already seen that districts differed in their preferences among sundry equivalent locutions, but a speaker of Greek would be understood without the slightest difficulty wherever he went throughout the immense area over which the Greek world-speech reigned. With the caveat already implied, that inscription-Greek may contain literary elements which are absent from an unstudied private letter, we may use without misgiving the immense and ever-growing collections of later Greek epigraphy. How much may be made of

them is well seen in the *Preisschrift* of Dr. E. Schwyzer,[1] *Grammatik der Pergamenischen Inschriften*, an invaluable guide to the accidence of the *Κοινή*.

Finally we have modern Greek to bring in. Dr. Albert Thumb's *Handbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache* gives us now the material for checking statements about modern Greek, which are often based upon the artificial Greek of the schools. The great work of Hatzidakis, *Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik*, with its perpetual references to the New Testament, shows forcibly how many of the developments of the modern vernacular had their roots in the *Κοινή* of two thousand years ago. The gulf between the ancient and the modern vernacular is bridged by the material collected and arranged by Professor Jannaris in his *Historical Greek Grammar*. It will soon be realized that the illiterate papyri of the early Christian centuries are far nearer to the common speech of Greece in our own time than to that of Attica in the fourth century B.C.[2] And even the educated colloquial Greek in which St. Paul wrote finds illustration constantly in the popular dialects of to-day. We may leave for the present the enforcing of this thesis, which will come out in practice at every step of our inquiry.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

[1] He was Schweizer in 1898, when this book was published, but has changed since, to our confusion. He has edited Meisterhans' *Grammar of the Attic Inscriptions*, and written the interesting lecture on *Die Weltsprache*, named above.

[2] Cf. Hatzidakis in *Rev. d. Et. gr.* 1903, p. 220, who says, "The language generally spoken to-day in the towns differs less from the common language of Polybius than this last differs from the language of Homer."

(*To be continued.*)

STUDIES IN THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN.

III.

The Old and New Commandment.

Beloved, it is no new commandment that I write to you,
But an old commandment which you had from the beginning;
The old commandment is the word which you heard.
Again, it is a new commandment, that I write to you:
Which thing is true in Him,—and in you;
Because the darkness is passing, and the true light now shines.
He that says he is in the light and hates his brother, is in the darkness even till now;
He that loves his brother, abides in the light,
And no occasion of stumbling exists in him;
But he that hates his brother, is in the darkness,
And he walks in the darkness, and knows not where he is going;
Because the darkness has blinded his eyes.

—1 *John* ii. 7–11.

The keeping of God's commands, it has been shown in the last paragraph, is the test of a real knowledge of Him; this criterion distinguishes the true from the false γνωστικός (*vv.* 3, 4). In "the word" of God His commandments have their recognized expression, and in "the love of God" their sovereign principle and means of fulfilment (*v.* 5). The example of Jesus Christ is the pattern of obedience to them, which we Christians are bound to copy (*v.* 6). St. John is stating what should be perfectly familiar to his disciples; he almost apologizes for the reiteration of these elementary matters, which the sophistries of current Gnosticism, and the discrepancy of faith and practice that it exhibited, had rendered necessary. "In this insistence upon a practical obedience to God as the witness of your knowledge of Him, and on the meeting of all duty in love, I am not setting before you anything new; I am telling the old story, and repeating the old command from the lips of Jesus. You heard it when the Gospel first reached you long ago; it has been sounding in your hearts ever since."

The commandment that the Apostle intends can be none other than Christ's law of love for His disciples—that which our Lord singled out from all the Divine precepts and made specifically His own by saying, "This is My commandment, viz., that you love one another, as I loved you" (John xv. 12); this commandment supplies the touchstone of all the rest. It is *the* commandment of our Epistle, recurring six times in its five chapters, and is dwelt upon at length in verses 9–11 just below. To the duty of *love* the writer challenges his "beloved" (cf. iv. 7, 11)! so addressing the readers for the first time in his letter. Some excellent interpreters find the ἐντολή of verses 7, 8, in the command to follow Jesus, which is gathered from verse 6. They argue that the immediately foregoing rather than the following context should supply the basis of this sentence; if it were merely a question of contextual sequence, their preference would be justified. But the point of St. John's appeal lies in the fact that the commandment he means is a trite and well-known rule, the watchword and motto, the ever-sounding order of the day, for those to whom he writes; it is a precept distinct and conspicuous, which must occur of itself to the readers and needs no previous definition or introduction. There was one, and only one, law of the Christian life, as John's disciples understood it, of which this could be said; and it was, not the general obligation to copy the pattern of Jesus, but the specific rule coming from His lips and impressed on His people by His whole life and death, that those who believe in Him *should love one another*. The ὀφείλει καθὼς ἐκεῖνος περιεπάτησεν καὶ αὐτὸς περιπατεῖν of the last verse does not constitute, but it suggests and leads up to the ἐντολὴ παλαιὰ καὶ καινή of verses 7 and 8, which is virtually enunciated and largely enforced in verses 9–11.

Moreover, the command ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους was characteristic of St. John along with his Master, "no new com-

mandment" to those reared upon his teaching. It was the burden of his ministry, and gained him the title of "the Apostle of Love." The story goes that "in age and feebleness extreme," when no longer equal to any other public teaching, he would have himself carried in his chair by the young men into the assembly, and while all listened reverently for the few words he might be able to utter, the old father in God would look round on them and say, "Little children, love one another!" When this had occurred repeatedly, at last some one asked him, "Why, father, do you always say this to us, and nothing more?" "Because," he replied, "it is the commandment of the Lord; and because when this is done, all is done." The great commandment of Christ and of the Gospel—old and not new, old and yet new—the Alpha and Omega of practical religion, could be nothing else for the Apostle John than the Christian law of love.

It may be convenient to reverse the order of St. John's exposition in this passage, and to fix our attention first on the contrasted positions of the breaker and the keeper of Christ's commandment outlined in verses 9–11, and then on the contrasted aspects of the law itself—its antiquity and its novelty—indicated in verses 7 and 8. By this means we may throw into greater relief the salient features of the paragraph.

I. *The man that breaks the Christian rule* is "he who . . . hates his brother" (ὁ μισῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, *vv.* 9, 11), as *the man that keeps the Christian rule* is "he who loves his brother" (ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, *v.* 10). Of the former it is said that he "is in the darkness" even while he says that "he is in the light," so that "he walks in the darkness," and consequently "knows not where he is going" (*vv.* 9, 11): the way and the end of life, the path he is taking and the goal he is making for, are both hidden from him, and while he misses his own way, he hinders

others and sets offences in the road for them (*σκάνδαλον . . . ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτῷ*, *v.* 8). Of the latter, of him who obeys and copies Christ in serving God and man by love, the counter-assertions are made, explicitly or implicitly, at each point: "he dwells in the light," and nothing in him makes others stumble (*v.* 10); he walks on a lighted pathway, to a visible and assured goal (*v.* 11).

St. John deals in these plain and broad antitheses—light and darkness, love and hate, righteousness and lawlessness, eternal life and death. He knows nothing of the half-light, the nuances and intermediate shades, in which modern thought with its strained subjectivity, its sensitiveness to the complex conditions of life, its analytic subtlety and critical irresolution, habitually works. Everything with him is simple, severe, and grand in construction. There is the classical purity of line and directness of movement in his mental conceptions, while there burns under the calm surface of his speech a lambent fire too intense for passion, and a flood swells too deep for any tumidity or turbulence of phrase. His *ἀγαπῶν* and *μισῶν* are the oppugnant types of humanity—the child of God and of the devil respectively (iii. 8–11), the embodiments of Heaven and Hell upon this earth, the two fundamental parties of humanity, the elementary factors to which the Apostle would reduce all the antagonisms that exist in the soul and in society.

But the character defined in verse 9 is no abstract type, no mere impersonation of the bad element in humanity. St. John has an actual personality in view—the kind of man with whom he was confronted in the schismatics of the day, and whom his discerning readers would at once identify by the definition *ὁ λέγων ἐν τῷ φωτὶ εἶναι καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ μισῶν*. This is just the Gnostic boaster of verse 4 over again: *ὁ λέγων ὅτι Ἔγνωκα αὐτόν* (sc. *τὸν Θεόν*), *καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ μὴ τηρῶν*. The first part of that previous description is here generalized (by way of recalling

the fundamental announcement of i. 5), while the second part of it is specialized: to say, "I have known God," is to say, "I am in the light"; to hate one's brother is, in principle, to break all the commandments of God. The bitter prating religionist, who would serve God with a busy intellect and unquiet tongue out of a cold and proud heart, is ignorant of his own sin, and in his vaunted knowledge is the most deceived of men (i. 8, 9). This brood of "vain talkers and deceivers" were swarming and buzzing about the Churches of Asia Minor, swollen with the pride of their religious culture and full of scorn and provocation toward Christian brethren, toward those who followed the ways of a plain old-fashioned faith, and who could not admit their pretensions or "go forward" (2 John 9) into paths that led away from the Apostolic witness concerning Christ. This contempt and ill-will toward fellow-believers of itself proved them to be "in the darkness," instead of their living in the higher and purer light of God that they claimed to have reached. God, who "is light," in being so "is love" (i. 5, iv. 8). To St. John's mind, there is a flat contradiction between walking in the light, or knowing God, and hating a brother; the two conceptions are logically exclusive, for hatred is of the substance of spiritual darkness; of itself it "blinds the eyes" of those walking in it. Not from above, but from beneath, comes the message that the new teachers bear, since they do not "walk in love" and set at naught "the old commandment"; not out of a clearer light, but out of a profound and miserable darkness do those voices speak that are charged with so much arrogance and anger.

The verb *μισέω* is broader and more elastic than our word "hate"; it covers, in St. John's vocabulary, the whole region of personal feeling opposed to *ἀγαπάω*. Neutrality, a poise of mere indifference to one's fellows, is impossible, as the Apostle conceives things; one likes or dislikes, one

is moved to sympathy or antagonism, toward every personality one touches. And to be in contact with a Christian brother, a true child of God, and yet to be moved by distaste or scorn toward him, is to show the absence in oneself of a Christian heart; not to love "the brother whom one has seen" is practically, on the part of the professor of Divine knowledge, to fail in love to God, "whom he has not seen" (iv. 20 f.), but whose spirit dwells in that rejected Christian man. The term "brother" must be quite strictly understood, if St. John's contention is to be maintained. Neither here, nor anywhere else in the New Testament, does ὁ ἀδελφός signify "the brother-man," though the doctrine of human brotherhood has its surest roots in the New Testament; nor is it synonymous with ὁ πλησίον of our Lord's story of the Good Samaritan in Luke x. The affinity of character linking the Christian brother to God who is his Father (iii. 1, 2, 9, 24, iv. 13, 20, v. 2, etc.) is the underlying assumption which makes this further test of a spurious Christian knowledge (cf. *v.* 4) so just and so effective in its bearing. The phrase ἕως ἄρτι (*till this moment, usque adhuc,* Vulg.: cf. John ii. 10, v. 17, xvi. 24; also Matt. xi. 12, 1 Cor. iv. 13, xv. 6) at the close of the verse describes, with a touch of surprise and reproach, the state of darkness in which these ill-conditioned Gnostics are found, as continuing unbroken—while "the true light" has been shining around them (*v.* 8), and while they congratulate themselves on walking in it more truly than others—till this very hour![1] Throughout they have remained in the darkness of their sin, and are so at this moment; never yet has their heart been touched by the love of God or man; their soul's windows are shuttered and barred against the dawn of the Christian day. Of this sort were the "false prophets," whom St. John will shortly

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. iv. 11, 13, where ἕως ἄρτι at the end of the sentence repeats ἄχρι τῆς ἄρτι ὥρας at the beginning.

denounce (in *v.* 18 ff.), who "went out from us because they *were not of us*"; the root of the matter was never in them.

The three clauses of verse 11 indicate, beside *the state* of the acrimonious professor of Christianity, *the course* and *the issue* of his life: he "is in the darkness, and he walks in the darkness, and he knows not whither he goes." If he "*walks* in the darkness," it is because he "*is* in the darkness": his conduct matches his character; he cannot act otherwise than he is, or walk in any other element or region than that where his habitation lies. His acts of hostility and words of contempt, his expressions of repugnance toward worthy Christian brethren, only reveal the gloom of his spirit, the alienation from God and goodness in which he dwells. And with all his cleverness and intellectual insight, he sees nothing of the doom that lies before him; such lack of foresight is the natural effect of living "in the darkness" of sin against God; he has no idea where his self-conceit, and the animosity that he indulges toward men better than himself, are leading him. He thinks that he is nearing perfection, that he is on the highway to heaven. By his ambitious speculations and refined notions, and his communion with rare and exalted minds, he affects to rise far above the common herd of men to the infinite source of light and being. How tragic the self-delusion! his bent is in the very opposite direction; while he seems to mount, he is sinking; his sails are filled with the breeze of heaven, but some malignant hand upon the rudder steers his ship of life to the shores of perdition. Amid Christian enlightenment, possessing the name and knowledge of a Christian believer and rich in privilege, one thing he lacks—a loving and simple Christian heart; for want of the one thing needful, the best that he possesses is turned to its meanest and worst.

The Apostle writes in chap. iii. 15, "Every one who hates his brother is a murderer"; and Jesus had declared, "He who says to his brother, 'Thou fool'! is liable to the measure of hell fire"! (Matt. v. 22).[1] The man supposed by St. John forgets such words as these, or misses altogether their bearing on himself; he does not in the least perceive whither his evil heart tends, what are the crimes of which he is capable, and with what ruin for himself and mischief for others the seeds of malice that lodge in his soul are pregnant. No man is in greater spiritual peril than the self-complacent cynic, the Pharisaic intellectualist and contemner of his kind; and no man, commonly, is less sensible of his peril and more incapable of reproof.

"Because the darkness has blinded his eyes:"[2] the fumes of pride and anger, the dust of party conflicts, the mists of speculation and opinionativeness obfuscate the conscience, and shut out from minds otherwise strong and clear the primary truths of religion and the plainest distinctions of right and wrong. St. John ominously repeats in these terms of warning words spoken by Jesus in His last appeal to the Jewish people (John xii. 35): "Walk as you have the light, lest the darkness overtake you; and he that walks in the darkness, *knows not whither he goes.*" Little did the Israelite nation dream of the sequel to their rejection of Jesus Christ, the world's true light, of the downfall to which their infatuate pride and their "odium humani generis" were hurrying them. St. John and his con-

[1] The verb *ὑπάγω*, "to go away," implies, as Westcott intimates, future destination (destiny), since it signifies leaving the present scene. It is the term used by Jesus of His departure to the Father (*οἶδα πόθεν ἦλθον καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγω*, John viii. 14), and by the Evangelist speaking of His departure; cf. John viii. 21 f., xiii. 3, 33, xiv. 28, xvi. 5, 10, 17.

[2] 2 Cor. iv. 4 affords a striking parallel to the language of St. John here: *ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσεν τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων κ.τ.λ.* (cf. also John xii. 40 f.). There the blinding is that of an unbelief which forbids from the outset the reception of the Christian light; here of a misbelief, which perverts that light when it has been intellectually received, and turns it into the contrary element.

temporary readers were witnesses to the result which stands as history's severest admonition against religious pride and inhumanity.

There lies in verse 10 another tacit accusation against the unloving Christian professor. While he hastens to shame and ruin himself, he strews hindrances in the path of others: it is by way of contrast that St. John writes of the lover of his brethren, *σκάνδαλον οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ*—"not in him," but in the other, "there is offence." Every schism and separation is a scandal against the Church. Every ill-tempered or contemptuous, every passionate, irritable, churlish, ungenerous man who bears the name of Christ, blocks the path of life for those who would enter. The spiteful story, or mean insinuation, or cruel sarcasm, the hasty and unjust reproach, the act of pride or resentment, the look of cold indifference or aversion, is another stone of stumbling thrown into the much hindered way of God's work in the salvation of human souls. Pointing to such examples, the unbeliever finds excuse to say, "If this is your Christian, I prefer men of the world. If conversion produces characters like that,—better remain unconverted"! Such offences, Jesus once said, "must needs come; but woe to him through whom they come"! To remove them, and to combat their ruinous influence, is amongst the Church's constant tasks; she has none sadder nor more difficult.

All that has been said of the *μισῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ* holds in the opposite sense of the *ἀγαπῶν*. Not only "is he in the light," he "abides" in it (*ἐν τῷ φωτὶ μένει, v.* 10), making his resort and domicile there, and growing into familiar and congenial relations with it. His eyes are open; his path is safe; his goal is visible and assured. The light that "now shines" about him pervades his soul and assimilates his nature to itself; it fills the universe for him, illuminating the world, life and

death, things present and to come, with a meaning and a glory that the manifestation of God in Christ alone can give to our existence. Safe himself, by the daily services of love, by copying the sacrifice of Christ, he makes the way of life safer and easier for others; he walks it not alone, but bringing many with him. He keeps step and time in his life's march with the great brotherhood of those who in the love of Christ and the Father have evermore "one heart and one way."

II. Now we return to verses 7 and 8, to the double aspect of the law itself, whose operation we have viewed in the contrasted types of character that are produced under it. The commandment of love is *not new, but old*; again, it is *new while it is old*.

1. "Beloved, no new command am I writing to you, but an old commandment" (*v.* 7): *how old?* The rule of Christian love is at least as old to the readers as their first hearing of the gospel: "the old commandment," the Apostle adds, "is the word which you heard." It is part of "the message which we [Apostles] have heard from Him and report unto you" (i. 5). The essence of the Gospel was breathed into this law of Christ, so that it forms essentially "the word" which the readers many years back had listened to from the lips of John and others of their first Christian teachers. St. John is now an aged man, and has been at Ephesus probably for nearly a generation; the Church in this province had already a history, before his settlement there. Many of those who read his letters had been brought up within the fold of Christ and under the Apostle's pastorate; the image of Christ and the thought of the Christian brotherhood blended with their earliest recollections. Christianity and its law of love were no untried novelty, no fresh invention, like the Gnostic rules and speculations that were growing rife in Asia Minor; they were traditional and of long standing in that region by the

end of the first century, and in the circle where this venerable and late-surviving Apostle of Jesus Christ still moved. He has nothing to reveal to his readers or to impose upon them other than that they had known and held from the beginning. Naturally, as it is with old men, John's thoughts turn to the past; standing upon this sure foundation of God, on the ground of the Church's settled faith and practice, he confronts all innovators, and lays his stern arrest on men who, as he puts it in his short letter to the Lady Elect, "go forward and abide not in the teaching of Christ" (2 John 9).

To ourselves the same precept comes as the "old commandment," which we "had from the beginning," the word which we "heard" as the first accents of the gospel fell upon our ears, at a mother's knee or from a father's reverend lips. With the command, "Little children, love one another," the grace and truth that came by Jesus Christ challenged our opening hearts in life's morning hour. But to us the "old command" has an antiquity vastly extended and enhanced. For the older of the Apostle's readers, the commencement of the Gospel and the commencement of their own Christian experience were almost conterminous. They "had" it "from the beginning," and "heard" it so soon as its sound went abroad. In our case a wide interval exists between the two. Christianity has behind it now the tradition, not of two, but of sixty generations; its origin carries us back to a remote beginning. "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" is the chain which runs through the nineteen centuries and binds the modern to the ancient world, linking the peoples and the ages into brotherhood. In the corporate life of Christendom—flawed and imperfect, yet real and deeply working—there lies the surest bond of humanity, and this commandment is its central cord. The love of Christ is the focus of history. The long train of blessing that has followed from

obedience to its rule, the peace and progress and moral well-being, the spiritual treasures of a Christianly ordered home and commonwealth, ever accumulating as they descend, are a witness to us—greater witness no historical system or institution can produce—that the law of Christ is the best guarantee of human happiness, is the ultimate and one possible basis of communion for the family of God on earth. "Other foundation can no man lay." This principle of brotherly love may be traced working age after age in the ascent of man, through the growth of knowledge and the spread of freedom and the widening of human intercourse; it has called out and arrayed against it, for reproof and overthrow, the powers of darkness—pride, sensuality, cunning, the treachery and cruelty and immeasurable selfishness of the evil heart of unbelief. In the diffusion of Christ's Spirit, in the proclamation and the practice of His simple law, supported by His grand example, the light "shines" more and more widely "in the darkness," and the darkness everywhere reacts and repels it, but "overcomes it not."

But if the commandment is so old as this, if it comes from the first fountain of the Gospel, and is part and parcel of the life of Christ amongst men, it must be older still. Christianity was not an invention, but a revelation. Nothing that is of its essence was really new and unprepared. Its roots are all in the Old Testament; its principles were hidden in God who created all things. The Only-begotten came forth from the bosom of the Father, bringing on His lips from that source this law for God's children. He came to show what God eternally is, and what in His eternal purpose men are bound themselves to be. "Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever the earth and the world were framed," God was wisdom, and God was *love*. This commandment is grounded in His changeless being. God surely could not create, could not conceive of, such

creatures as ourselves otherwise than under this law, otherwise than as designed to love Him and each other. Creation and Redemption are parts of one order, are animated by one soul. The commandment is verily, in its ultimate basis and real beginning, old as the creation of the race, old as the love and fatherhood of God. Jesus rested it upon the foundation when He bade His disciples be kind to the evil and unthankful, for He says, "You shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect." The relation of the child of God to its eternal Father imposes on it this and no lower or meaner ideal.

When the Apostle reminds his readers that they "had" this commandment "from the beginning," his backward gaze did not stop short of the absolute starting-point. St. John sees everything *sub specie æternitatis*; ὃ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς is the title of his Epistle; it is the "*eternal* life" manifested in Jesus Christ and communicated through Him to men, of which he thinks and writes from the first sentence to the last (i. 2, v. 20). ἀπ' ἀρχῆς may, to be sure, have a limited reference given by the sentence where it stands, as in verse 24 below, and in iii. 11, 2 John 6, where it qualifies ἠκουσατε,[1] or in John xv. 27, Luke i. 2. But if no such limitation is given, one presumes that St. John is reaching back to the unconditioned "beginning"; and this presumption is strengthened by the recurrence of ἀπ' ἀρχῆς in the same sense a few verses later (*vv.* 13, 14). It is with a meaning therefore, and by way of distinction, that the Apostle adds to his ἦν εἴχετε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς a second and parallel definition, (ὁ λόγος) ὃν ἠκούσατε. "Which you *heard*" brings the readers down to the historical and subjective origin of the ἐντολή, which, in respect of its objective and absolute point

[1] To the influence of those parallels doubtless the erroneous ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς of the Textus Receptus in this place is due. Its effect has been to identify the clauses εἴχετε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς and ἠκούσατε, which really stand in a sort of contrast.

of departure, they "had[1] *from the beginning*" (cf. 2 John 5). Rothe's comment on the sentence goes more deeply into St. John's thought than Westcott's: "'From the beginning' points us back to the first clause of the Epistle —'You *had* from the beginning' that 'which *was* from the beginning.'" When the Apostle says later, in explaining the newness of the command, that "the darkness is passing by, and the true light now shines," manifestly its oldness is the antiquity of that which existed long before the present age; it was *there*, only the darkness eclipsed it and made it to be as though it were not. Of Christ's great ἐντολή, as of Himself (John i. 10–11), it may be said: "It was in the world, and the world knew it not; it came unto its own, and its own people received it not."

2. Verse 8 turns the other side of the shield. "Again, it is (though old) *a new commandment* that I write to you." The old Apostle has still the eyes of youth. New buddings and unfoldings, the fresh aspects of primitive and well-worn truth, he is quick to recognize. The teaching of his Gospel, so astonishing in its philosophic scope and its adaptation to the Hellenic mind when considered as the work of a Galilean Jewish author, is evidence of this. He knows how not merely to vindicate the old against the new, which is so often impatient and irreverent towards it, but how to translate the old into the new and discern the old in the new under its altered face—and this is, after all, the right way of guarding the old; it is the genuine conservatism. If St. John lives out of the past, he lives in the present and for the future.

To say "I write no new but an old commandment," could never be the Apostle's last word about Christ's

[1] Had the historical sense of ἠκούσατε belonged to εἴχετε, one would have expected a parallel construction, in the historical aorist, ἔσχετε; or the present ἔχετε might have been used of a continuous possession, "from the first day until now." The imperfect tense expresses the tentative and growing possession of that which is infinite in its source.

law of love. He had seen, and was seeing still to his latest days, so many new creations born of this Word which "was from the beginning," and such a world of young, eager, growing life was in the Churches that spread before his eyes, stretching east and west and filling the face of the world with new fruit of the Kingdom, that to him change was even more in evidence than identity, and the progress was as manifest as the persistence of the truth. St. John had watched the profoundest spiritual revelation which the world has ever experienced. A new heaven and earth were in the making for mankind; and the law that governed this creation, if old in its origin as the being of God, was new in its operation as the character of Jesus Christ—old as the thought of the Eternal, new as the Cross of Jesus, or as the latest sacrifice of a life laid down for His love's sake. That which is old as one looks up the stream of time and travels backward to the origins, is new at each point as the journey of thought is reversed. The commandment is old as that out of which the present has grown, new as that by which the past is done away and in which the future is germinally hidden; old to the eyes of memory and faith, new to the eyes of prophecy and hope; old as a potential, new as a dynamic energy; old in its eternal foundations, in its Divine, intrinsic nature, new in its gradual, constant, and as yet incomplete developments; old as the ever-shining sun, new as the daybreak and the morning light; old as creation, new as individual birth.

GEORGE G. FINDLAY.

(To be continued.)

THE LETTERS TO THE SEVEN CHURCHES.

IX. The Letter to the Church in Ephesus (*continued*).[1]

After the formal heading, which is prefixed to the letter proper, each of the Seven Letters begins by a statement intimating that the writer possesses full knowledge of the character and position of the Church which he is addressing. In five out of the seven letters this intimation begins, "I know thy works." But in the cases of Smyrna and Pergamum, the opening is different: "I know thy tribulation" and "I know where thou dwellest." The difference is evidently due to their peculiar circumstances. He who wishes to prove his full knowledge of the Church in Smyrna, says that he knows its sufferings; because these were the striking feature in its history. And in Pergamum the most prominent and distinguishing characteristic lay in its situation, "where the throne of Satan is:" by that situation its history had been strongly influenced.

But in most cases what is essential to know about a Church is what it has done; and so begins the Ephesian letter. The past history of the Ephesian Church had been one of labour and achievement, enduring and energetic. Above all it had been distinguished by its insight into the true character of those who came to it with the appearance of Apostles. It lay on the great highway of the world, visited by many Christian travellers, some coming to it for its own sake, others merely on their way to a more distant

[1] In page 164, line 20, the name of Diocletian has slipped in where Domitian is meant.

destination. Especially, those who were travelling to and from Rome for the most part passed through Ephesus: hence it was already, or shortly afterwards became, the highway of the martyrs, "the passage-way of those who are slain unto God," as Ignatius called it a few years later, i.e., the place through which must pass all those who were on their way to Rome to amuse the urban population by their death in the amphitheatre.

Among these there came to Ephesus, or passed through it, many who claimed to be teachers; but the Ephesian Church tested them all; and, when they were false, unerringly detected them and unhesitatingly rejected them.

The recital of the past history and the services of the Church occupies a much greater proportion of the Ephesian letter than of any other of the Seven. The writer dwells upon it with emphatic appreciation. After describing the special kind of work in which the Ephesians had been most active and useful, he returns again to praise their career of patience and steadfastness, and describes their motive—"for my name's sake"—which enhances their merit. The best counsel, the full and sufficient standard of excellence for the Ephesians, is to do as they did of old. Others may have to improve; but Ephesians are urged not to fall short of their ancient standard of action.

The best commentary on this is found in the letter of Ignatius to the Ephesians, with its profound and frank admiration, which might seem almost to be exaggerated were it not justified by the language of St. John. The Syrian bishop wrote as one who felt that he was honoured in associating with the envoys from the Ephesian Church and in being "permitted by letter to bear it company, and to rejoice with it." Ignatius [1] shows clearly in his letter the reasons for his admiration. The characteristics which he praises in the Ephesian Church are the same as those which

[1] Ignat. *Eph.* § 9: see EXPOSITOR, Feb. 1904, p. 84.

St. John mentions. And yet they are so expressed as to exclude the idea that he remembered the words of this letter and either consciously or unconsciously used them: "I ought to be trained for the contest by you in faith, in admonition, in endurance, in long suffering,"[1] § 3: "for ye all live according to truth and no heresy hath a home among you; nay, ye do not so much as listen to any one if he speak of ought else save concerning Jesus Christ in truth," § 6: "as indeed ye are not deceived," § 8: "I have learned that certain persons passed through you from Syria,[2] bringing evil doctrine; whom ye suffered not to sow seed in you, for ye stopped your ears," § 9: "you were ever of one mind with the Apostles in the power of Jesus Christ," § 11.

The ideas are the same; but they are scattered about through Ignatius's letter, and not concentrated in one place. Moreover the words are almost entirely different. The idea of testing, which is prominent in St. John, is never explicitly mentioned by Ignatius, and yet it is implied and presupposed in the passages quoted from §§ 6, 8, 9. But he was interested only in the result, the successful championing of truth, whereas St. John was necessarily interested quite as much in the way by which the Ephesians attained the result.

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Ignatius was not

[1] Of the three words used by St. John *ὑπομονή*, *κόπος*, *βαστάζειν*, Ignatius uses only the first, which almost forced itself on any writer. In the following passages the only word of importance that occurs in the corresponding passages in St. John is "Apostles"; and Ignatius uses it of the true Apostles, St. John of the false.

[2] *ἐκεῖθεν*, from yonder, referring to some place unmentioned which was much in his own mind, and which would naturally spring to the mind of the Ephesian readers. There was only one place, which the Ephesians would naturally connect with Ignatius, when he mentioned no name; and that was Syrian Antioch: cp. *τῶν ἐκεῖ πιστῶν* at the end of the letter (Syria is there named in the context). Lightfoot suggests that Ignatius meant "yonder" as Philadelphia; but there was no reason why such a reference should have been intelligible to the readers in Ephesus.

familiar with the letter of St. John. He could hardly have kept so remote from the expression of this letter, if it had been clear and fresh in his memory. There is no proof that the Revelation had become familiar in Syria so soon after it was written.

Hence the testimony of Ignatius may be taken as entirely independent of the Revelation, and as showing what was the general estimate and reputation of Ephesus in the Christian world about the beginning of the second century. It had not grown weaker or less brilliant in the interval since St. John wrote.

But, while nothing is required of the Ephesians except that they should continue to show their old character, yet a return to their earlier spirit was urgently necessary. The fault of the Ephesian Church was that it no longer showed the same spirit: the intense enthusiasm which characterized the young Church had grown cooler with advancing age. That is the serious danger that lies before them; and it is the common experience in every reform movement, in every religion that spreads itself by proselytizing. The history of Mohammedanism shows it on a large scale. No religion has ever exercised a more rapid and almost magical influence over barbarous races than Islam has often done, elevating them at once to a distinctly higher level of spiritual and intellectual life than they had been capable of even understanding before. But in the case of almost every Mohammedanized race, after the first burst of enthusiastic religion, under the immediate stimulus of the great moral ideas that Mohammed taught, has been exhausted, its subsequent history presents a spectacle of stagnation and retrogression.[1]

The problem in this and in every other such case is how

[1] On this fact, and the reason for it, lying in the position of women and the consequent want of any true home education, see *Histor. Comm. on Epistle to Galatians*, p. 388.

to find any means of exercising a continuous stimulus, which shall maintain the first enthusiasm. Something is needed, and the writer of this letter perhaps was thinking of some such stimulus in the words that follow, containing a threat as to what shall be done to Ephesus, if it continues to degenerate, and fails to reinvigorate its former earnest enthusiasm. But a less serious penalty is threatened in this case than in some of the other letters—not destruction, nor rejection, not even the extirpation of the weak or erring portion of the Church, but only "I come in displeasure at thee, and will move thy lampstand, the Church, out of its place."

Some commentators regard the threat as equivalent to a decree of destruction, and point to the fact that the site is a desert and the Church extinct, as a proof that the threat has been fulfilled. But it seems impossible to accept this view. It is wrong method to disregard the plain meaning, which is not destruction but change; and equally so to appeal to present facts as proving that destruction must have been meant by this figurative expression.

Surely in this milder denunciation we may see a proof that the evil in Ephesus was curable. The loss of enthusiasm which affected that Church was different in kind from the lukewarmness that affected Laodicea, and should be treated in a different way. The half-heartedness of the Laodiceans was deadly, and those who were so affected were hopeless, and should be irrevocably and inexorably rejected. But the cooling of the first Ephesian enthusiasm was a failing that lies in human nature. The failing can be corrected, the enthusiasm may be revived, and if the Ephesians cannot revive it among themselves by their own strength, their Church shall be moved out of its place.

Equally unsatisfactory is another interpretation, that Ephesus shall be degraded from its place of honour, which implies an unconscious assumption that Ephesus already

occupied its later position of metropolitan authority in the Asian Church. As yet Ephesus had no principate in the Church, except what it derived from its own character and conduct; while its character continued, its influence must continue; if its character degenerated, its influence must disappear.

The threat is so expressed that it must be understood of a change in local position: "I will move thy Church out of its place."[1]

The interpretation of Grotius is nearer the truth: "I will cause thy population to flee away to another place."[2] I do not know whether the form in which he expresses his interpretation is due to the belief current in the country that the Christian people of Ephesus fled to the mountains and settled in a village four hours distant, called Kirkindji, which their descendants still consider to be the representative of the ancient Ephesus. But if Grotius had that fact in view, his interpretation does not quite hit the mark. The writer of the seven letters was not thinking of an arbitrary fact of that kind, which might befall any city, and was in no way characteristic of the real deep-seated nature of one more than of another. He had his eye fixed on the broad permanent character of Ephesian scenery and surroundings, and his thought moved in accord with the nature of the locality, and expressed itself in a form that applied to Ephesus and to no other of the seven Churches.

There is one characteristic that belongs to Ephesus, distinctive and unique among the cities of the Seven Churches: it is change. In most ancient sites one is struck by the immutability of nature and the mutability of all human additions to nature. In Ephesus it is the shifting character of the natural conditions on which the city depends for

[1] κινήσω ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῆς.
[2] Efficiam ut plebs tua alio diffugiat

prosperity that strike every careful observer, every student either of history or of nature. The scenery and the site have varied from century to century. Where there was water there is now land: what was a populated city in one period ceased to be so in another, and has again become the centre of life for the valley: where at one time there was only bare hillside or the gardens of a city some miles distant, at another time there was a vast city crowded with inhabitants, and this has again relapsed into its earlier condition: the harbour in which St. John and St. Paul landed has become a mere marsh, and the theatre where the excited crowd met and shouted to Diana, desolate and ruinous as it is, has been more permanent than the harbour. The relation of sea and land has changed in quite unusual fashion: the broad level valley was once a great inlet of the sea, at the head of which was the oldest Ephesus, beside the Temple of the Goddess, where the modern village stands. But the sea receded and the land emerged from it. The city followed the sea, and changed from place to place to maintain its importance as the only harbour of the valley. A thousand years before Christ Greek colonists had built their new city, a commercial town, in rivalry and opposition to the old town of the Goddess, on the slope of the southern mountains; and after some centuries had passed the Greek city and the older native city had been merged in one; and that united city again had migrated to the Ephesus which was known to St. John.

All those facts were familiar to the Ephesians; they are recorded for us by Strabo, Pliny, and Herodotus, but Ephesian belief and record are the foundation for the statements of those writers. A threat of removing the Church from its place would be inevitably understood by the Ephesians as a denunciation of another change in the site of the city, and must have been so intended by the writer. It should be taken up, and moved away to a new spot,

where it might begin afresh on a new career with a better spirit. But it would be still Ephesus, as it had always hitherto been amid all changes.

Such was the meaning that the Ephesians must have taken from the letter; but no other of the Seven Cities would have found the words so clear and significant. Others would have wondered what they might mean, as the commentators are still wondering and debating. To the Ephesians the words would seem natural and plain.

But after this threat the letter returns to the dominant note. The Ephesian Church was still, as it had been from the beginning, guarding the way, testing all new teachers, and rejecting with sure judgment the unworthy. In the question which beyond all others seemed to the writer the critical problem of the day the Ephesians agreed with him, and hated the works of the Nicolaitans. In the other letters that party in the early Church is more fully described. In the Ephesian letter they are only named.

X. Peroration of the Ephesian Letter.

The peroration of each of the Seven Letters is modelled in the same way: all contain a claim for attention and a promise. The former is identical in all Seven Letters: "he that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the Churches"; and needs no further comment. The latter is different in every case, being adapted to the special character of each.

There is a difference among the letters in regard to the arrangement of the peroration: in the first three the claim for attention comes before the promise, in the last four it comes after. It is doubtful whether there is any special intention in this, beyond a certain tendency in the writer towards employing variety as a literary device. Almost every little variation and turn in these letters, however, is carefully studied; and probably it is through deliberate

intention that they are divided by this variation into two classes; but what is the reason for the division and the principle involved in it, is hard to say. The first three ranked also as the three greatest cities of the Province, vying with one another for the title "First of Asia," which all three claimed. In the general estimation of the world, they certainly formed a group by themselves, while the others were second-rate. It may be that this difference almost unconsciously affected the writer's expression and produced a variation in the form, though the variation apparently conveys no difference in force or meaning, but is purely literary and formal.

An attempt has been made to explain the variation on the ground that the first three Churches are regarded as having on the whole been faithful, though with faults and imperfections; whereas the last four have been faithless for the most part, and only a "remnant" is acknowledged in them as faithful. But, while that is true of three out of the four, yet Philadelphia is praised very highly, with almost more thoroughness than any even of the first three, except Smyrna; and it is the only church to which the Divine author says "I have loved thee."

The promise contained in the peroration is different in every case, and is evidently adapted in each instance to suit the general tone of the letter and the character and needs of the city. To the Ephesian who overcometh, the promise is that he shall eat of the tree of life, which is in the Garden of God. Life is promised both to Smyrna and to Ephesus; yet how differently is it expressed in the two cases. Smyrna must suffer, and would be faithful unto death, but it shall not be hurt of the second death. Ephesus had been falling from its original high level of enthusiasm; it needed to be quickened and reinvigorated, and none of the promises made to the other Churches would suit its need; but the fruit of the tree of life is the

infallible cure, the tree whose very leaves were for the healing of the nations, the tree in which every true Christian acquires a right of participation (xxii. 2, 14).

Thus ends the letter. It is a distinctly laudatory one, when it is examined phrase by phrase: it shows admiration and full appreciation of a great career and a noble history. Yet it does not leave a pleasant impression of the Ephesian Church; and there is a lack of cordial and sympathetic spirit in it. The writer seems not to have loved the Ephesians as he did the Smyrnaeans and Philadelphians. He respected and esteemed them. He felt that they possessed every great quality except a loving enthusiasm. But when, in order to finish with a word of praise, the writer seeks for some definite laudable fact in their conduct at the present moment, the one thing which he finds to say is that they hated those whom he hated. Their disapproval and their hatred were correctly apportioned: in sympathy and love they were defective.

They stand before us in the pathway of the world, at the door by which the West visited the East, and from which the East looked out upon the West, as a dignified people worthy of their great position, who have lived through a noble history in the past, and are on the whole not unworthy of it in the present, who maintain their high tradition—and yet one thing is lacking, the power of loving and of making themselves loved.

XI.—Character of the Letter to the Church in Ephesus.

Every image or idea in this letter finds a parallel or an illustration in Jewish thought and literature. Yet it cannot be said with truth that the letter is exclusively Jewish in tone. There is nothing in it which would seem strange or foreign to the Hellenic or Hellenized people for whom the book was in the first instance written. Even the tree

of life carried no un-Hellenic connotation to Ephesian readers. The tree was as significant a symbol of life-giving Divine power to the Asian Greeks as to the Jews, though in a different way. Trees had been worshipped as the home of the Divine nature and power from time immemorial, and were still so worshipped, in Asia Minor as in the ancient world generally. On some sacred tree the prosperity and safety of a family or tribe or city was often believed to depend. When the sacred olive-tree on the Acropolis of Athens put forth a new shoot after the city had been burned by the Persians, the people knew that the safety of the State was assured. The belief was widely entertained that the life of a man was connected with some tree, and returned into that tree when he died. The tree which grew on a grave was often thought to be penetrated with the spirit and life of the buried man; and an old Athenian law punished with death any one that had cut a holm-oak growing in a sepulchral ground, i.e. heroön.[1]

It will probably seem to many persons an unworthy and even irrational procedure to trace any connexion between the superstitious veneration of sacred trees and the symbolism of St. John. But it was shown in Section V.[2] that although Ignatius abhorred paganism, and though the memory of his pagan days caused a lasting sense of shame in his mind, yet he could compare the life of a Christian congregation to the procession at a pagan festival, and could use symbolism derived from the pagan mysteries to shadow forth the deepest thoughts of Christianity. In all those cases the same process takes place: the religious ideas of the pagans are renovated in a Christian form, ennobled, and spiritualized. The tree of life in the Revelation was in the mind of the Ephesians a Christianization of the sacred tree in the pagan religion and folk-lore: it was a

[1] On the subject see Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. v. p. 113.
[2] Expositor, Feb. 1904, p. 91 ff.

symbolic expression which was full of meaning to the Asian Christians, because to them the tree had always been the seat of Divine life and the intermediary between Divine and human nature. But to us the "tree of life" carries little meaning. It seems to us little more than a metaphor in this passage, and in chap. xxii. a mere detail in a rather fanciful and highly poetical allegory. A considerable effort is needed before we can even begin dimly to appreciate the power which this idea had in the minds of Ephesian readers: we have to recreate the thoughts and mind of that time, before we can understand their conception of the "tree of life."

Accordingly, although the "tree of life" is different from any expression that occurs, so far as known, in Greek literature, it contains nothing that would seem strange or exotic to Greeks or Asians. And every other idea in the letter would seem equally natural, and would appeal to equally familiar beliefs and habits of life. While we need not doubt that the writer took the "tree of life" from his own Jewish sphere of thought, yet he certainly avoids in all these letters anything that is distinctly anti-Hellenic in expression. He is in advance of, not in hostility to, the best side of Hellenic thought and education, so far as the letters are concerned.

This is all the more remarkable in view of the strenuous opposition, the almost bigoted hatred, that is shown in these letters to the views of the Nicolaitans. Their theory on life and religion, on the deep thought and philosophic character of which they prided themselves,[1] undoubtedly emphasized the Greek side of Christianity, and attempted, in the practical working out of Christian teaching, to maintain as a rule of life the closest possible relation with

[1] In ii. 24 it is clear that they contemptuously contrasted their advanced teaching with the simplicity and unphilosophic character of the teaching which St. John champions.

the best customs of ordinary society in the Asian cities. This attempt was in itself quite justifiable and right; but in the judgment of St. John (and we may add of St. Paul [1] also) they went too far, and tried to retain in the Christian life practices that were in diametrical opposition to the essential principles of Christianity, and thus they had strayed into a syncretism of Christian and anti-Christian elements which was fatal to the growth and permanence of Christian thought.

The opposition to the Nicolaitans determines the whole character and form of the Seven Letters. But the writer does not make the mistake of going to the opposite extreme, minimizing the share that Greek thought and custom might have in the Christian life, and exaggerating the opposition between Greek education and true religion. He holds the balance with a steady hand; he expresses himself in a form that should be clear and sympathetic to the Greek Churches whom he was addressing; he gives quiet emphasis to the best side of Greek education in letters which are admirable efforts of literary art and power; but at a certain point his sympathy stops dead; beyond that point it was fatal to go.

In studying St. Paul we found ourselves forced to recognize the essential agreement of his views on this question with St. John's: Expositor, Feb. 1901. Now in studying St. John we find ourselves forced to the same judgment. With superficial differences they both take the same calm, sane view of the situation as a whole, and legislate for the young Church on the same lines. Up to a certain point the converted pagan should develop the imperfect, but not false, religious ideas and gropings after truth of his earlier years into a Christian character; but there was much that was absolutely false and fundamentally perverted in those ideas, and all that part of them must be inexorably eradicated

[1] See the fuller statement in the Expositor, February 1901, p. 103 ff.

and destroyed. The determining criterion lay in the idolatrous element: where that was a necessary part of pagan custom or opinion, there was no justification for clinging to it: unsparing condemnation and rejection was the only course open to a true Christian. Hence arose the one striking contrast in outward appearance between the views of the two Apostles. St. Paul clung to the hope and belief that the Church might develop within the Empire, and find protection from the Imperial government. St. John regarded the Imperial government as Antichrist, the essential and inevitable enemy of Christianity. Between the two lay the precise formulation of the Imperial policy, which imposed on the Christians as a test of loyalty the performance of religious ritual in the worship of the Emperors. The Empire armed itself with the harness of idolatry; and the principle that St. Paul laid down in the sharpest and clearest terms at once put an end to any hope that he had entertained of reconciliation and amity between the Church and the existing State.

The letter is framed on a plan common to all the Seven Letters. It is therefore not a true letter, but a literary composition, which is cast in the form of a letter because that form had already established itself in usage. Now the writer certainly did not select this form merely because it was recognized in the pagan literature. He selected it because it had already become recognized as the characteristic and the best form of expression for a certain class of Christian parænetic literature. A philosophic exposition of truth was apt to become abstract and unreal; the dialogue form, which the Greeks loved and some of the Christian writers adopted, was apt to degenerate into looseness and mere literary display; but the letter, as already elaborated by great thinkers and artists who were his predecessors, was determined for him as the best medium of expression. In this form literature, states-

manship, ethics, and religion met, and placed the simple letter on the highest level of practical power.[1] Due regard to the practical needs of the individual congregation addressed prevented the writer of a letter from losing hold on the hard facts and serious realities of life. The spirit of the lawgiver raised him above all danger of sinking into the commonplace and the trivial. Great principles must be expressed in the Christian letter. And finally it must have literary form as a permanent monument of teaching and legislation.

It was a correct literary instinct that led John to express the message to the Seven Churches in letters, even though he had to work these letters into an apocalypse of the Hebraic style, a much less fortunate choice. In each letter, though it was only a literary Epistle addressed to a representative Church, the writer was obliged to call up before his mind the actual Church as he knew it; and thus he has given us seven varied and individualized pictures of different congregations, all distinctly recognizable.

Probably the opposition and criticism which he was sure to experience from the Nicolaitans stimulated the writer to reach the high standard of literary quality which characterizes the Seven Letters in spite of the neglect of traditional form and rule. He uses the language of common life, not the stereotyped forms of the historian or the philosopher. As Dante had the choice before him between the accepted language of education, Latin, and the vulgar tongue, the popular Italian, so St. John had to choose between a more artificial kind of Greek, as perpetuated from past teaching, and the common vulgar speech, often emancipated from strict grammatical rules, but nervous and vigorous, a true living speech. He chose the latter.

Yet, in spite of the obvious reasons for using a different and more colloquial class of Greek in this work than in the

[1] Expositor, Dec. 1903, p. 420 ff.

historical work which we know as the fourth Gospel, the difference between the two works as regards grammatical construction and language has been made an argument against their common authorship. Such an argument assumes that there was no element of volition and choice in determining the admitted difference of style. But just as the style of Luke varies to a remarkable degree in different parts of his work according to the subject and scene, in a way which is certainly deliberate and intentional, so it is at least conceivable that the variation in St. John's work is intentional. That however is a large question on which it is impossible to enter here; but it may be added that the fact that the three formal Epistles approximate more to the style of the history than of the Apocalypse is not inconsistent with the suggestion just made.

I take the opportunity of quoting from Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, Leipzig, 1903, p. 42 (where he describes the importance of Silence in the mystic ritual), some confirmation of the opinion stated in Section V. that Ignatius attached such Divine value to Silence under the influence of his pagan experience in the Mysteries. The instructions were given to the *mystes* "lay thy right finger on thy mouth and say, Silence! Silence! Silence! symbol of the living imperishable God." Silence is even addressed in prayer, "Guard me, Silence"; where Dieterich remarks that the capital S is needed. I did not see Dieterich's fascinating book until March 1904.

W. M. Ramsay.

THE SEVEN CHURCHES OF ASIA.

Professor Ramsay's interesting paper in the January number of the Expositor throws much light on the intercommunication of the Churches of Asia Minor, but I do not see that it completely solves the problem: "Why did St. John speak of 'the seven Churches' when there must have been so many others?" Nevertheless it certainly assists the solution.

The seven cities were neither the largest, nor the most important, nor the most representative of different portions of the province, nor have we any right to assume that they were the most Christian among Asiatic towns. Professor Ramsay has therefore pointed to the probability that in the year 94 some ecclesiastical postal system had already grown up in Asia. The Churches had become grouped and crystallized into postal districts, according to their geographical distribution, and the seven cities are, so to speak, the post-towns for seven groups. A main line of communication would start from Ephesus, and make a circle through these post-towns; and from each of them a subordinate circle would pass through a number of outlying cities. "These seven cities were the most suitable points for distributing the letters to the groups of Churches in the easiest way and the shortest time by seven other messengers, who . . . made secondary circuits from the seven representatives" (p. 27). It is thus explained why the great cities of Magnesia and Tralles are omitted—they had a postal service direct from Ephesus. The unimportant cities of Thyatira and Philadelphia were junctions respectively for "an inland district on the north-east and east" (this is somewhat vague—where there really any Christian cities between Thyatira and Mount Temnus?), and for upper

Lydia, and for this reason they are included among "the Seven Churches."

Now the last portion of Professor Ramsay's paper appears to destroy the thesis upheld in the earlier parts. It is headed "III. *The Letters address single Churches.*" That is to say, they are *not* addressed to postal districts, groups of Churches.

"The seven letters were written by one who was familiar with the situation, the character, the past history, the possibilities of future development, of those seven cities. The Church of Sardis, for example, is addressed as the Church of that actual, single city; the facts and characteristics mentioned are proper to it alone, and not common to the other churches of the Hermus valley. Those others were not much in the writer's mind: he was absorbed with the thought of that one city: he saw only death before it: it was a city of appearance without reality, promise without performance, outward show betrayed by careless confidence. But the other cities which were connected with it may be warned by its fate, and he that overcometh shall be spared and honoured" (pp. 33–4).

It is evident that such a warning would be just as useful to the rest of the Churches of Asia, or of the world, as to those whose post-town was Sardis. But the letter was intended for Sardis alone. The Apostle had no idea of addressing the whole of Asia, but seven particular Churches, which he styles "*The* Seven Churches of Asia," *αἱ ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαι αἱ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ.*

The article is all-important, and Professor Ramsay has made no attempt to account for it. "*The* Seven Churches" implies that there were no others; and yet we can hardly think that there were no longer any Christians at Colosse, at Miletus, at Troas, and so forth, or that there were not yet any at Tralles or Magnesia, which had each its bishop in the days of St. Ignatius.

Now, if we assume the generally accepted date of 93–6 for the Apocalypse, we find that it is divided by as much as 30–40 years from the Epistles of St. Paul, the first Evangelist of Asia. St. Paul addressed his letters indifferently to "the

Church" or to "the saints" of such and such a city. Any community of "saints," together with its *episcopi* or presbyters, is a Church in his eyes. None of the Pauline Churches appear ever to have had a bishop in the lifetime of their founder, and ecclesiastical organization was still in a somewhat incoherent condition.

But the letters of St. Ignatius are only 10–23 years later than the Apocalypse. Asia was now full of Christians. In Bithynia and Pontus the sacrifices were no longer frequented. Organization had become a necessity, and tradition points to St. John as the author of the system we find existing under Trajan. Between the Apocalypse and the Ignatian letters there is not time for a revolution. St. Ignatius implies that, when he wrote, every more important city, at least, had a bishop. We can hardly venture to assume that every one of these sees had been erected since the return of St. John from exile.

St. Ignatius constantly assumes that a Church is an organism, containing a bishop, priests, deacons and faithful. Without bishop and priests, he once asserts, there is no church: *χωρὶς τούτων ἐκκλησία οὐ καλεῖται*, "No Christian community which has not yet been organized so as to possess a bishop as well as priests, has a right to the name of *ἐκκλησία*" (*Trall.* 3. 1) This statement is the more remarkable because St. Ignatius calls his own Church "The Church in Syria," probably implying that there was no other Church in Syria but that of Antioch.[1]

We conclude that the growth of ecclesiastical organization has necessarily narrowed the meaning of the word *ἐκκλησία*, just as it narrowed the meaning of the word *ἐπίσκοπος*. Henceforward *ἐκκλησία* is not used of any lesser ecclesiastical unit than the episcopal see, and we hear

[1] When the other communities of the province *Oriens* received bishops, the Church of Antioch became a patriarchate instead of a diocese. The same is true of the evolution of the Alexandrian patriarchate.

no more of a "Church" governed by presbyters, still less of the "Church" in the house of such an one.[1] If we attribute the new discipline itself to the author of the Apocalypse, we shall be inclined to attribute to the same author the narrowing of the terms ἐπίσκοπος and ἐκκλησία.

It would seem to follow that "the seven Churches of Asia" are those seven of the Christian communities of the province which St. John had had time to organize under episcopal government, and which are consequently of especial interest to him. Others he may have organized after his return (as Clement Al. says, *Quis dives*, 42, and ap. Eus. *H.E.* iii. 23) if he still had strength, but the mystic number seven sums up his accomplishment before his exile.

The mention of the "angels" of the Churches is an indication that these seven Churches actually possessed bishops. Many ancient fathers and modern commentators identify the angels with the bishops. According to Dr. Moulton, the angels in Apoc. i. 20 are rather the "heavenly doubles" of the Churches.[2] This seems to be more exact. "The seven candlesticks are the seven Churches," and they stand upon the ground. "The seven stars are the angels of the seven Churches," and they are the reduplications of the candle-flames, held in the hand of the Son of God, as it were in heaven. St. John will have combined the idea of guardian angels with that of celestial counterparts, just as in Daniel the angels of the kingdoms are "princes" as well as representatives.[3]

[1] The letter of Clement, about this time, still calls the large community of Corinth a "Church," as St. Paul had done, though it had apparently no bishop as yet.

[2] In a very interesting article, "It is his angel," in *Journal of Theol. Studies*, July 1902, p. 514.

[3] "Even in Daniel," says Dr. Moulton, "the representative angels are not free from guardian functions" (p. 517).

But the seven letters cannot possibly be intended to be delivered by the Apostle to the heavenly doubles who are in the hand of Christ. They are, on the contrary, sent down from heaven to earth, to be communicated to the real Churches by the seer of the vision. In a mystical book like the Apocalypse, and in mystical letters like these seven, we can hardly venture to take the "angels" invariably in a literal sense. If we admit that in i. 20 the actual angels are meant, we shall not be wrong in interpreting them mystically in the addresses of the letters.

The bishop, according to early doctrine, is precisely the earthly guardian and representative of his Church. His title, ἐπίσκοπος, declares that he is its guardian. But he is also its representative, almost its "double," before God and men. He is answerable for it before God, he is its mouthpiece, he is its head, *unde scire debes episcopum in ecclesia esse et ecclesiam in episcopo* (*Cyprian, Ep.* lxvi. 8). St. Ignatius would evidently endorse this view. The seven Churches would readily understand the mystic signification, for they would be aware why it was they were entitled "*the* seven Churches," and they would be familiar, as we are not, with St. John's teaching both as to angels and as to bishops.

Two questions remain. Why had these Churches rather than others been organized? Why are they mentioned in this particular order?

Until I had the pleasure of reading Professor Ramsay's article, it had not struck me that these questions could be solved, but now I think he has supplied the answer.

St. John, according to tradition, made Ephesus his headquarters, and he will have established a bishop there in the first place. It was natural that he should next provide a chief pastor for the rival cities of Smyrna and Pergamus. Having reached Pergamus by "the oldest Roman road in the province Asia," he found before him "the great imperial

post-road" which would lead him to the important towns of Sardis and Laodicea. As he had to pass Thyatira and Philadelphia on the way, it was natural that he should not fail to establish bishops in these also. On arriving at Laodicea, he may have thought that Colosse and Hierapolis were too small to need bishops at once, or there may have been local reasons for delay, such as jealousies, or want of a suitable subject to appoint. But it is more likely that he was summoned suddenly to Ephesus, perhaps by a messenger of Domitian, for we find that he was unable to stop in the great towns of Tralles and Magnesia (through which he must have passed), so as to give them bishops. They were not far from Ephesus, and it would be easy to visit them on another occasion. Probably he actually appointed Polybius and the predecessor of the youthful Damas[1] as bishops of these sees immediately after his return from Patmos. The order in which the letters are given is the order in which St. John had visited the cities. It is consequently also the order in which a messenger would deliver them, if a messenger ever did deliver them. It seems to me infinitely more probable that St. John never wrote out the seven letters separately at all, for they would be unintelligible without the first chapter, which supplies a common introduction to all. I suppose that he wrote down the whole Apocalypse while he was in Patmos (without an amanuensis, as the freedom and incorrectness of the style suggests), and that on his return to Ephesus[2] he had it copied and sent round to the Churches as a complete work.

[1] Ignat. *ad Magn.* 3.

[2] So Victorinus Petav., *in Apoc.* cap. x. 11 (P.L. v. 333): "Ibi ergo vidit Apocalypsin. Et Joannes de metallo dimissus, sic postea tradidit hanc eamdem quam acceperat a Deo Apocalypsin." The reading is the same in the shorter text, *Bibl. Max, PP.* iii. p. 419. The best MS. (Ottobon. lat. 3288A) has: "Ibi ergo videtur Johannes Apocalipsin conscripsisse. Et cum iam seniorem se putasset post passionem recipi posse, interfecto

[The above was in type before Prof. Ramsay's article appeared in the EXPOSITOR for March, or I should have dealt with it more explicitly. It is interesting to note that Dr. Zahn has pointed out that the Apocryphal Acts of John appear to have made the Apostle perform a journey through the seven cities in the order given by the Apocalypse, just as I have suggested (*Neue kirchl. Zeitschr.* vol. x. p. 191 ff. I take this reference from Bardenheuer, *Gesch. der altkirchl. Lit.* ii. p. 440). Was this a conjecture, or founded on tradition?]

JOHN CHAPMAN.

NOTE.—Through the courtesy of the Editor I am allowed to append a note to the proof-sheets of Dom Chapman's Paper, which I have read with much interest.

1. Dom Chapman thinks that I in Section I. expressed the view that the Seven Letters were addressed to seven districts, and in Section III. contradicted my first view, and declared they were addressed to seven single Churches. My meaning must have been badly expressed, or Dom Chapman has read my poor article with little care. The Seven Churches had come in the course of years to possess a certain outstanding and, therefore, representative character in the Province (as shown in Section I.): thus they stood forth as "the Seven." For reasons of his own St. John preferred to write to the Seven Churches, instead of to the collective Church of Asia. The "postal system" was a necessity of their life, and had been for thirty years in existence and growth.

2. He says that the form of expression, "*the* Seven Churches," implies that there were no others. That seems to me incorrect. The form does not necessarily imply more than that there were Seven Churches, outstanding and

Domitiano omnia iudicia eius soluta sunt, et Johannes a metallo dimissus est, et sic postea tradidit hanc eandem apocalipsin quam a domino acceperat." Victorinus is apparently citing (as usual) a very early authority.

conspicuous in universal estimation. The meaning which Dom Chapman takes would also, of course, be a possible one, but not the only possible one.

3. He says that when Ignatius calls his own Church "The Church in Syria," he implies that there was no other Church in Syria but that of Antioch. This statement also seems to me erroneous. Antioch stands for Syria: it *is* Syria, just as Ephesus *is* Asia in the phraseology quoted in Section VIII. (to which I may refer). This whole idea of representative, outstanding Churches is a most characteristic feature in the thought of that period; and, if I may venture to say so, Dom Chapman in his Paper has failed to grasp it sufficiently or to apprehend it clearly. In this Paper his way of thinking moves only in the forms of the nineteenth century: it needs some effort to think as people thought about A.D. 90, and he is here hardly giving himself the trouble to make that effort (a quality common to many other great and deservedly respected scholars). The adoption of the Seven to represent the Province (and again to represent the entire Church in the whole world) suits the symbolic tone of the whole book. Further, one can hardly avoid the inference that the popular recognition of "the Seven" constituted an appreciable step in the development towards an organized hierarchy of higher and lower bishoprics.

3. Dom Chapman also seems to think that I hold the Seven Letters to have been delivered separately to each Church. This also fails to catch my purpose; and I fear I must have been obscure. The Apocalypse is obviously a single work, and the Seven Letters are part of the symbolic machinery of the complicated allegory; but they were written only for their place in the book and had no separate existence. And yet they are written each to the individual Church, which for the moment stands bare and alone before the mind of the writer. I see no inconsistency

between these statements; but Dom Chapman seems to think that if the letters had been written to individual, definite, single, separate Churches, they would necessarily have a separate existence as single letters. I can only hope that he will think it worth while to read my Paper a second time, trying to sympathise with my way of thinking (which is perhaps too archaic and remote from twentieth century forms); and in Section VIII. I have already printed a restatement in (I hope) less mistakable form of what I have been trying to express—the first-century mode of thought which so readily ran into symbolism.

4. I cannot think that the appointment of bishops took place either so late or in such a capricious, uncertain way as Dom Chapman makes out. In accordance with my general point of view on this subject, I can feel no doubt that there were more than a score of bishops in the Province Asia, one in every city where a congregation existed, at the time when the Apocalypse was written. Law and principle seem to me to have been much more efficacious, and individual effort and action much less determining, than they seem to him to have been in the growth of the early Church in Asia.

But I may be wrong, and Mr. Chapman may be right. While I maintain what seems convincing to my own humble judgment, and while I must either write clearly and sharply what I think or else be silent altogether, I quite acknowledge that there is room for other views, which I cannot hold (perhaps from blindness or incapacity), and it is well that they should be stated in the precise way in which he sets them forth.

W. M. Ramsay.

THE TESTIMONY OF JESUS IS THE SPIRIT OF PROPHECY.

(Revelation xix. 10.)

The phrase "the testimony of Jesus" occurs six times in the Apocalypse (i. 2, 9; xii. 17; xix. 10 bis; xx. 4), and nowhere else in the New Testament; and commentators are by no means unanimous as to the exact meaning of the words. Some, as Ewald, explaining "the testimony of Jesus" to signify, testimony borne or teaching given by Jesus, the Christian Revelation in fact; others, such as Alford and de Wette, maintaining that the genitive is objective, and means, testimony borne to Jesus by men and angels; while others again, such as Lee, in *The Speaker's Commentary*, think that the phrase is ambiguous and combines equally the subjective and objective aspect of the μαρτυρία.

At first sight it would seem as if the strongest arguments were those in favour of the subjective genitive, testimony borne by Jesus. The idea of testimony or witness is a leading one in the Fourth Gospel, and there it is always of witness borne by some one or something. Again, in four of the five passages cited above, the Word or Commandments of God, where, of course, the genitive is always subjective, is conjoined with the testimony of Jesus: "John . . . bare witness of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ" (i. 2). "I . . . was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus" (i. 9). "Her seed [the woman's], which keep the commandments of God, and hold the testimony of Jesus" (xii. 17). "I saw the souls of them that had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God" (xx. 4). Moreover, taking the word witness in its narrowest meaning, we find that the demeanour and words of Jesus,

when on His trial, did, as a matter of fact, make a profound impression on the imagination of the Apostolic Church. Years before S. John wrote down the details of that memorable scene where The Truth "bears witness unto the truth," S. Paul, in charging Timothy to "keep the commandment," recalls, as a supreme example of steadfastness, "Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed the good confession" (1 Tim. vi. 13).

And so in the Revelation itself one of the special titles of Jesus Christ is "the faithful witness," "the faithful and true witness" (i. 5; iii. 14), who at the close of the book "testifies the things" recorded by the seer (xxii. 20). Thus is emphasized the fulfilment in Jesus of one of the promised functions of Messiah, "Behold, I have given him for a witness to the peoples" (Isa. lv. 4.).

It may then be regarded as certain that in the mind of S. John the expression "the testimony of Jesus" primarily connoted the witness borne by the Incarnate Son to the world concerning the Father and His gracious dealings with men; but it by no means follows that the other aspect of the phrase, the witness borne by the Church concerning her Divine Master, was absent from his thoughts.

The two indeed are complementary, or rather different methods of regarding the same thing; for the new revelation given by Jesus of the relations of God and man, includes of necessity a revelation of His own Person and Work in the Divine economy; and, we may ask, what is, and always has been, the testimony borne to Jesus by the Church save the lesson learnt from His own lips?

It was stated just now that the exact phrase "the testimony of Jesus" only occurs in the Apocalypse. Yet we find two very similar expressions in S. Paul's Epistles (where, however, *μαρτύριον* is used, not *μαρτυρία*), "The testimony of Christ" and "The testimony of our Lord."

"The testimony of Christ was confirmed in you," he reminds the Corinthians (1 Cor. i. 6). "Be not ashamed," he exhorts Timothy, "of the testimony of our Lord" (2 Tim. i. 8).

In both these cases the most suitable meaning is preaching concerning Christ, the objective genitive; and of course this is the meaning which would naturally rise first to the mind of a man actively engaged, as was S. Paul, in evangelization, one who knew that to the Eleven Christ had said, just before His Ascension, "Ye shall be my witnesses . . . unto the uttermost part of the earth" (Acts i. 8), and who remembered that the same Christ had appointed him a witness of the things wherein he had seen and should see the Lord Jesus (Acts xxvi. 16).

We now turn to the difficult passage which we have selected for elucidation. This is the first occasion on which the writer notes that he fell down before the feet of the angel-interpreter to worship him. And the terms in which the angel declines to accept such worship are very similar in both cases, yet with illuminating variations—

(1) "See thou do it not: I am a fellow-servant with thee, and with thy brethren *that hold the testimony of Jesus*: worship God: for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy" (xix. 10).

(2) See thou do it not: I am a fellow-servant with thee, and with thy brethren *the prophets*, and with them which keep the words of this book: worship God (xxii. 9).

It is not easy at first sight to see the connexion between the positive command, "Worship God," and the reason that follows, "*for* the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." This clause has nothing corresponding to it in the later answer of the angel, and yet it is the later answer that supplies an explanation of that which is difficult in the first. When we compare the two replies of the

angel we perceive that "thy brethren that hold the testimony of Jesus" are the same as "thy brethren the prophets," and in this correspondence lies the explanation of the connexion between the command and the reason alleged for it.

It is as if the angel had said: Not only is worship of me unreasonable, inasmuch as thou and I belong to the same order of being, but also thou art a prophet, and therefore thou oughtest to know and be guided by the true spirit of prophecy, and in regard of the object of worship the teaching of the prophets is necessarily determined by the testimony of Jesus. What did Jesus say when the tempter suggested that at the cost of one act of disloyal homage He might gain "all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them"? Jesus then testified, "It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve."

It can, I think, scarcely be doubted that the testimony against all forms of secondary worship incidentally borne by Jesus on the mount of temptation is alluded to in these words of the angel to S. John. And yet this does not exhaust the significance of these suggestive words. That this is so will appear when we have examined the phrase, "the spirit of prophecy."

Prophecy here refers exclusively to the ministry of the prophets of the apostolic and sub-apostolic Church, in the ranks of whom the writer of the Apocalypse claimed a place. It would be irrelevant here to discuss at length the place that prophets occupied in the apostolic Church. S. Paul places them next to apostles in his enumeration of the degrees of spiritual gifts in 1 Corinthians xii. and also in Ephesians iv. They were the acknowledged recipients of a special gift from God, rather than members of a regularly ordained ministry, and we can see now that as a distinct order they had no necessary place in the Church after it became definitely separated from Judaism;

for the institution of prophets was that which gave Christianity at the first its right to exist in the Jewish mind. It gave the Church a *locus standi* in the Jewish world.

John the Baptist was not merely the last prophet of the Old Covenant. He revived the conception of prophecy as an actual present day force among men. The example of John the Baptist made men familiar with the prophet as an irregular yet legitimate exponent of spiritual truths in the Mosaic system. It would, I think, convey a completely false idea to say that the leaders of the Church seized on this idea in order to gain recognition from Jews. The thing happened quite naturally, and was not part of an ecclesiastical policy.

The relation of the Catholic Church to the Jewish Synagogue was that of a sucker to the parent-plant. In the case of plants that are propagated by suckers it is necessary that the young plant should continue to draw its nourishment from the parent-stock, remain in fact part of the old plant, until it has put forth its own roots. Then it is necessary that the connexion between the two be severed.

So it was in the beginnings of the Gospel. The Catholic Church from the very outset contained within it germs of development not only of an independent life, but of a life antagonistic to Judaism; and yet for some years, almost for a generation, the Catholic Church was, did not merely seem to be, but was an organization within the confines of Judaism, much as the various religious orders —Jesuits, Franciscans, etc.—enjoy now an independent life within the wide embrace of Romanism.

It was the institution of prophets that gave the Church its *locus standi* in Judaism; for although after the election of the Seven we read that "a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith" (Acts vi. 7), yet it is evident

that all through the period covered by the Acts the official hierarchy in general were hostile, bitterly hostile, to the new movement. They felt that it was the deadly enemy of their system, and at the same time they could not yet convince the majority of their fellow-citizens that they were right. "Thou seest, brother," says S. James to S. Paul, "how many myriads there are among the Jews of them which have believed; and they are all zealous for the law" (Acts xxi. 20).

This divided allegiance was, of course, bound to come to an end as the Church developed; but it did last for a considerable time, and was doubtless justified in the popular mind by the manifestation of prophetical functions in the Christian Sect or Way.

It is significant that the institution of prophets lingered on in the Churches of Asia Minor, which were notorious for their Jewish proclivities, long after it had ceased to exist as a distinct order elsewhere.

The characteristic function of prophecy has, of course, never ceased in the Christian Church, though we do not now call it by that name. "He that prophesieth," says S. Paul, "speaketh unto men edification, and comfort and consolation" (1 Cor. xiv. 3). The foretelling or forecasting of future events was, as in Old Testament times, a very subordinate and accidental function of the prophet. Moreover, in many cases, though not in all, the inspiration of the prophet needed recognition by the inspiration of those to whom he spoke. "Let the prophets speak by two or three, and let the others discern" (1 Cor. xiv. 29). By this direction S. Paul meant that those who had the gift of "discernings of spirits," though possibly unable themselves to prophesy, should discriminate between the utterances of the prophets, between those which were truly in accordance with the divinely guided mind of the Church, and those of less authoritative nature.

The Church, then, had a test by which true prophecy might be distinguished from false, and it is scarcely doubtful that, however the test might vary in form or fashion from time to time, it depended ultimately upon the Church's belief concerning the Person and Work of Christ our Lord. We have an example of this in the First Epistle of S. John (iv. 1–3). "Beloved," says the Apostle, "believe not every spirit, but prove the spirits, whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit which confesseth not Jesus is not of God." When these words were written the Church was being agitated with the Docetic controversy, and the objective reality of the Incarnation was the test-question, the answer to which determined whether one who claimed to be a prophet was worthy of credence on any subject whatsoever affecting the Christian life.

We are now in a position to grasp the other aspect of the words: "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." They do not only mean that the testimony borne by Jesus as regards worship being due to God alone is that which should guide prophecy, but also that genuine Christian prophecy is essentially characterized by its bearing testimony concerning Jesus; as S. Paul reminds the Corinthians, "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus as Lord, and ourselves as your servants for Jesus' sake" (2 Cor. iv. 5).

We touch here a foundation-principle of Christianity. I cannot do better than quote the words of Prebendary Row (*Manual of Christian Evidences*, chap. ii.): "Christianity stands in marked contrast to every human institution, in that its entire system, its inner life, and its sole principle of cohesion are based on the personal history of its

Founder. . . . To this the entire history of man presents nothing parallel. . . . Three great religions, exclusive of Christianity, are now existing in the world . . . viz., Brahminism, Buddhism, and Mohammedanism. Two of these have known founders, whose memories are held in deep veneration by their adherents. Yet the essential principle of each consists in a body of dogmas, and not in a personal history; and their religions would still remain complete and entire if the personal history of their founders were forgotten. . . . But to remove the person of its Founder out of Christianity would be its destruction. Its key-stone would be removed from its arch, and its whole superstructure would collapse."

These words of Prebendary Row express clearly, and by no means too strongly, the great truth that Christ is Christianity. Christianity has sacred writings, a theology, and an organization, but it *is* not any of these things. It could conceivably exist without them. Without the living indwelling Christ both Bible and Church organization were dead. What Jesus said of His relation to His disciples has the widest possible application: "Apart from me ye can do nothing."

"The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." Any Christian preaching that does not either bear testimony to Jesus directly, or rest and depend on the testimony borne to Him by the Church throughout the ages, is but sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal.

It would be impossible now to enter upon a discussion of that testimony. What has Jesus been to nineteen centuries of saints? The magnificent hyperbole of the Fourth Gospel would alone adequately answer: "I suppose that even the world itself would not contain the books that should be written." For the Incarnate Son and Word, who is the Life of the Body of the Catholic Church and the Life of the individual members thereof,

manifests Himself "by divers portions and in divers manners" as the Church advances through the generations, and the individual grows in grace. Lord Houghton's lines partly express the ever growing, deepening, widening of the testimony borne to Jesus by the spirit of Christian prophecy :—

Mohammed's truth lay in a holy book,
Christ's in a sacred life.
So while the world rolls on from change to change,
And realms of thought expand,
The letter stands without expanse or range,
Stiff as a dead man's hand;
While as the life-blood fills the glowing form,
The Spirit Christ has shed
Flows through the ripening ages fresh and warm
More felt than heard or read.

N. J. D. White.

SOME RELIGIOUS USAGES OF THE DHÎÂB AND RUALA ARABS, AND THEIR OLD TESTAMENT PARALLELS.

Our interview with the Dhîâb Arabs was quite accidental. In seeking to go from the Jisr-er-Ruḳḳâd, in the Ḥaurân, to Chisfîn we lost our way, and, after eleven hours in the saddle, found ourselves near their encampment at el-Ḳaṣeibeh, in the Jaulân, about four and a half miles east of the northern end of the Sea of Galilee. The tribe derive their descent, as is common among the Arabs, from their alleged ancestor Dhîâb (wolves).[1] They are not nomads, but have permanent seats, though dwelling in tents. Near them was an encampment of the Ruala, a section of the great tribe of Aeneze, whose winter quarters are in the Nejd, in the Arabian Peninsula, and who spend their summers in the Ḥaurân and the Jaulân, separating into various encampments, and changing from place to place according to necessities of pasture and water. Tradition places the home of the hero of the Book of Job near Nawa, in the Ḥaurân.[2] The author could easily derive his scenic materials from some such district, where at evening one may see a procession of camels file past his tent for two hours. Without going into the Arabian Peninsula, one may get the true flavour of Arab life in the summer habitat of the Ruala in the Ḥaurân and the Jaulân.

At the encampment of the Dhîâb Arabs we learned the origin of the maḳâm which they had recently built to their saint and ancestor Dhîâb. Last spring cholera was raging at Tiberias, on the west shore of the Sea of Galilee. Instead of taking necessary hygienic precautions, they had

[1] For the employment of a plural as the name of a progenitor, cf. use of the dual Mizraim as the one who begat Ludim (Gen. x. 7).

[2] See Consul Wetzstein, in Delitzsch, *Das Buch Iob*, Leipzig, 1876, *Das Hiobskloster in Ḥaurân und das Land Uz*, pp. 551–604.

recourse, like other Arabs, as we had previously found, to their patron saint. Believing that evil as well as good are from God,[1] and considering Dhîâb more powerful than God,[2] they sought to secure his favour and protection by erecting to him a shrine out of rude basaltic stones, without any building, but with a wall around it. Each owner of a tent brought a white sheep, and made it go around the maḳâm once,[3] said "God is great," cut its throat, and sprinkled its blood on the front wall. They also put some of the blood on the forehead of each boy. They asked the pardon of their sins, because they had not built him a maḳam before, and expected forgiveness, so the cholera would not come to them.

Before they built the maḳâm they had the custom each spring that every shepherd should offer sacrifice. They take the blood of the sacrifice and sprinkle it on all the flock, so that "God may pass over it." Every owner of a firstborn male, whether calf, sheep or goat, on the day it is cast by its dam, should cut off a bit of its ear, to indicate that it is designated as a sacrifice,[4] and when it is weaned should slay it.

Like other Arabs they kill a sacrifice for a tent, either when they pitch a new one for the first time,[5] or after they

[1] Cf. *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day* (London, 1902), pp. 68, 69.

[2] The Dhîâb spoke of God as the source of the cholera. It is a common idea that the weli (saint) is more powerful than God. Miss Johnston, of the British Syrian Mission, Damascus, heard a very ignorant Druse woman say in response to the suggestion that something was by the power of God, "The power of God is (proceeds) from Saint John," *ḳudreh allâh min mâr Yuḥanna.*

[3] Wellhausen, *Reste Arabischen Heidentums* (Berlin, 1897), p. 109, writes: "Das wichtigste Stück des arabischen Cultus ist der Umgang um das Heiligtum, wobei sich Männer und Weiber sich beteiligten." In this case the sacrifices make the circuit of the sanctuary, sometimes three, seven, or even ten times.

[4] This occurs often. For laws regulating the sacrifices of Moslems, see Matthews, *Mischat ul-Masabih* (Calcutta, 1809), vol. i., pp. 319–322, 632–635; Hamilton, *Hedaya* (London, MDCCXCI), vol. iv., pp. 76–84.

[5] Sacrifices for caves and houses, see *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*

have enlarged it. The shed blood is a redemption (*fedu*)[1] for the tent and for the cattle. Any one who does not slay a sacrifice will lose some one from the inhabitants of his tent, or his cattle or flocks would die. If they should not kill the sacrifice, God would destroy them.

The same day we visited the tent of one of the three sheiks of the Ruala, who are brothers, and who share equally in authority over the tribe. The sheik who received us had the appearance of a refined gentleman. His hands were small, his voice low, his features fine, his smile was pleasing. He insisted on our partaking of his hospitality, and finally had a bowl of dates, with Arab butter (*semn*) in the centre, brought for our refreshment. By partaking of this provision we were assured of the friendship of the tribe. In order that we might learn their customs we took to our encampment a man eighty years of age, who, on each birthday, since he was five, had cut a notch each year on a stick. In the summer of 1902 we also had interviews with members of the same tribe. The account which follows is a combination of three interviews—two held during the summer of 1902, and one during the summer of 1903. They agree substantially in the description of the same customs.

In 1902, at evening, we saw a great encampment near Nawa in the Ḥaurân. The next morning all was in motion; tents were being taken down, and the country was full of camels and Arabs. As the Arabs were passing on to new camping-grounds we witnessed a singular spectacle. There were perhaps a dozen camels, scattered at intervals, with four perpendicular poles fastened to the back of the camel. On the top of these, perhaps ten or twelve feet from the ground, a canopy was fastened, and on the top of this

(London, 1902), pp. 224, 225; for tents and houses, cf. *Ursemitische Religion im Volksleben des heutigen Orients*, Leipzig (1903), pp. 39, 201, 216, 228, 243.

[1] For the use of the term fedu, "redemption," see *Primitive Semitic Religion*, pp. 178, 195, 197, 200, 202, 205, 206, 209, 210, 232.

canopy rode an Arab girl prostrate on her bosom. These were sisters of heroes, or of Arabs who had distinguished themselves in battle. No others are permitted to ride in this way. When an Arab brave rushes off for the fray he says, "I am the brother of so and so," mentioning the name of his sister.

When the Emir is about to engage in battle he sacrifices a sacrifice to Abu'ẓ-Ẓuhûr. Before they slay it they lead it around the decorated camel, because it is the leader's camel, or that of the flag. Then they sprinkle the blood of the sacrifice on the merkab of the camel, a sort of canopy. Every tribe has one merkab; it is the one in which the sheik's daughter or sister rides and sings. She is put in the centre of the battle, as the beau ideal of Arab womanhood. She puts antimony on her eyelids (2 Kings ix. 30; Jer. iv. 30; Ezek. xxiii. 40),[1] makes herself handsome, perfumes her hair, and bares her bosom. Around this merkab the Arabs perform prodigies of valour. It is affirmed that such a tribe as has been compelled to surrender the sheik's sister or daughter may never send a girl into battle after such a capture.

They sacrifice to Abu'ẓ-Ẓuhûr, that he may help them to get the victory over the enemy. The following lines show their faith in Abu'ẓ-Ẓuhûr as a tribal war-god :—

Abu'ẓ-Zuhûr is wont to march surely,
For the success of those who put on their war-clothes;
And through him they are terrible.
In the time of battle their horses play finely,
Under a party of Arabs who are praised.
He who tastes the touch of thy spears,
His mustache will become white,
And his steed will turn back and flee away.

When ill or distressed they vow, each man according to

[1] Cf. Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians* (London, 1896), pp. 52, 53.

his ability, a camel or a sheep. During the month Rajab[1] most of the people of the tribe sacrifice a sheep for the sake of preserving the flock from disease or from being stolen.

Old Testament Parallels.

It seems certain that religious institutions, such as we find to-day among Syrians and Arabs, and which may be recognized in the Old Testament, go back to a prehistoric source,[2] which for convenience we call Semitic. In spite of the positive religion of pre-exilic Israel, of Judaism, Christianity and Islam, this prehistoric source may be detected in the institutions of the people as they may be seen at the present day. Professor Franz Delitzsch, years ago, when I was his pupil in Leipzig, recognized that sacrifice and other institutions had not been divinely revealed, but went back to more ancient foundations.[3]

In this article it is my object simply to trace the parallels afforded by the interviews with the Dhîâb and Ruala Arabs and the Old Testament.

1. Monolatry. This exists among the Dhîâb and the Ruala Arabs. Each tribe has practically adopted its ancestor as its tribal god. So Chemosh was the god of the Moabites and Milcom was the god of the Ammonites (1 Kings xi. 4-7). It seems too that monolatry existed in

[1] For a list of the Moslem months see Baedeker, *Syria and Palestine* (Leipzig, 1898), p. ciii.; for ragab, cf. Wellhausen, op. cit. pp. 97 f.

[2] Professor A. H. Sayce, writing from Cairo, December 14, 1903, in acknowledgment of the receipt of *Ursemitische Religion*, says: "I am not sure that you, too, do not make sufficient allowance for degeneracy, which has had quite as much influence, if not more, as 'development' in making man what he is to-day." On the other hand Schwally, in *Literarisches Centralblatt* (1903), cols. 1669-71, writes: "Alles was auf dem Gebiet dieser Bräuche weder dem Islam noch dem Christentum zugeschrieben werden kann, betrachtet Curtiss als ursemitisch. Das ist gewiss in vielen, ja wie Ref. glaubt, sogar in den meisten Fallen richtig."

[3] Cf. the clear statement of this subject by W. Robertson Smith in his *Religion of the Semites*. All my researches during the past five years confirm this view.

ancient Israel, as is claimed by the critics[1] (cf. 1 Sam. xxvi. 19). Really the most important political event in opening the eyes of the Jews, as a people, to the transcendent character of Yahwe as the God of all the earth was His defeat as a national God. The monotheistic conception of Him by the people as a whole was as truly the result of the Babylonian exile as the recognition of the true character and mission of Christ came only after His crucifixion and resurrection (Luke xxiv. 25–27). The materials for a study of the development of a local to a tribal God still exist among the Arabs.

2. Each tribe, according to the belief of those who compose it, is descended from its divinity by natural generation. The Dhiâb (or "wolves" Arabs) are the children of their grandfather "wolves." Such physical descent from a tribal progenitor is almost a universal idea among the Arabs.[2] To the Israelite the idea that Yahwe could have children is utterly repugnant, but certain expressions may have been coloured by a physical conception of sonship among other Semites. A passage in point is Exodus iv. 22, 23, where Moses represents God as saying to Pharaoh: "Thus saith Yahwe, Israel is my son, my firstborn: and I have said, Let my son go, that he may serve me; and thou hast refused to let him go: behold I will slay thy son, thy firstborn." The spiritual conception of God as Father in the Old Testament (Hos. xi. 1; Jer. xxxi. 9) has been divinely evolved from the physical conception of the ancient Semites.

3. The tribal God is a war-god. The representation of

[1] *Ibid.* p. 37.

[2] This is in accordance with my observations, cf. *Die Gottheit als Erzeuger des Menschen in Ursemitische Religion*, pp. 117–127. Much new material might be added from my investigations during the summer of 1902, indicating that when women bathe in sacred fountains they receive power to conceive through the weli who resides in such waters; cf. too the *Physical Relation of Man to God in Primitive Semitic Religion To-Day*, pp. 112–123.

Abu'ẓ-Ẓuhûr as helping the Ruala and giving them the victory over their enemies is a primitive conception, which was firmly maintained by the Israelites in its literal sense Moses promises Israel that Yahwe will fight for them (Exod. xiv. 14*a*), Yahwe is represented as taking off the chariot wheels of the Egyptians (*v.* 25). He goes before Israel and fights for them (Deut. i. 30; iii. 22; xx. 4). In Psalm xxiv. 8*c* Yahwe is celebrated as "mighty in battle," and not only so, but the command is given: "Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors; and the king of glory will come in" (*v.* 7). So among the Syrians to-day it is believed in some localities, that narrow gateways are lifted up, so that some sacred sheik may ride in.[1]

4. War among the Ruala Arabs, as we have seen, is inaugurated by sacrifice. Its blood is sprinkled on the merkab of the camel. So war in Old Testament times seems to have been inaugurated by sacrifice. There is not merely a hint of this as in Micah iii. 5, in a term used regarding war. "And whoso putteth not into their mouths, they even prepare (*ḳiddĕshu*) war against him," which is certainly consistent with the idea of sacrifice,[2] but there seem to be clear indications of such sacrifices in 1 Samuel vii. 7–9, where the Philistines are gathered together against Israel for battle. Israel begs Samuel to cry continually to Yahwe their God to save them out of the hand of the Philistines. Before the Israelites go into battle Samuel offers up a sucking lamb as a whole burnt offering unto Yahwe. He answers and terrifies the Philistines by thunder. Whether

[1] This interpretation was suggested to me by Professor J. Stewart Crawford, of the Syrian Protestant College, Beirut. I have observed confirmations of the idea that low gateways to sacred enclosures are miraculously lifted up when some "holy" man rides in.

[2] Cf. W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, pp. 382, 383, and Gesenius *Hebräische Handwörterbuch*, ed. Buhl, Leipzig, 895, p. 680, "den Kampf selbst, d.h. ihn unter religiösen Weihe anheben. (קִדֵּשׁ) Joel iv. 9; Micah iii. 5; Jer. vi. 4."

such sacrifices were common we cannot determine.[1] The immolation by Mesha, king of the Moabites, of his eldest son must be regarded as a sacrifice to Chemosh in his capacity as the god of war. The offering of a firstborn son is a reversion to the original type of human sacrifice, which the king adopted in his extremity, and which, as necessary, provoked great wrath against Israel who had made such an offering necessary (2 Kings iii. 27).

5. The tribal god is thought to have some special place of revelation. This is at his maḳâm. Thither sacrifices are usually brought, though not always.[2] The blood is sprinkled upon the shrine and is put upon the heads of the boys. There is, as has long been recognized, nothing original in the sacrifices of the ancient Israelites. Their ceremonies, under divine guidance, are simply the development of prehistoric usages which we find in force among Arabs and Syrians. The worship of Israelitish nomads is represented as being before Yahwe, whether at his altar (Exod. xx. 24 JE), or at His tent (Lev. i. 5, etc. P). As blood is sprinkled on the maḳâm, and is put on the foreheads of boys among the Dhîâb Arabs, so at the conclusion of the covenant half the blood is sprinkled on the altar and half on the people (Exod. xxiv. 4–6 JE). Here a basin is used; such a basin I saw at the shrine of Ḥamed el-Ḥudêfi.

6. Sin may consist in the neglect of some ritualistic observance. This was the case among the Dhîâb Arabs in their neglect to erect a maḳâm in honour of their ancestor. Sins of ignorance are of much the same sort in principle among the Dhîâb as those detailed in P (Lev. iv. 2, v. 15).

7. Shed blood, though repugnant to Islam and Judaism,

[1] W. R. Smith, *Ibid.* p. 383, note 1, and Schwally, *Kriegsaltertümer*, Leipzig, 1901, p. 51, quote Judg. vi. 19 f. 26; xx. 26; 1 Sam. xiii. 9 f., in support of the custom of such sacrifices among the ancient Israelites.

[2] All sacrifices for houses and tents and even those which are offered to some saint, where his shrine is far away, are offered at the dwelling of the one bringing the sacrifice.

is still imbedded from most ancient times in the life of the people, not only among Arabs and fellahîn, but also among Moslems of all sects, unless it be among the Metâwileh,[1] among most Christian sects,[2] and even among some Jews. During the annual festival at the lower shrine at Mount Carmel, known by the Jews as Eliyâhu, by the Christians as Mâr Eliâs, and by the Moslems as Chidr, the Jews bring sheep with their heads adorned with garlands inside the shrine, and ask Eliyâhu to accept the sacrifice from their hands.[3]

8. The firstling male of animals among the Dhîâb Arabs belongs to Dhîâb, so the firstling male among the Israelites belongs to Yahwe (Exod. xxxiv. 19 J; xiii. 12, 15 D; Num. iii. 13; xviii. 15 P, etc.). It is true that the reason assigned for this is that Yahwe slew all the firstborn of the Egyptians, and that therefore Israel should slaughter all the firstlings of beasts and redeem all the firstborn of men (Exod. xiii. 11–15). We are not to consider that this was a new custom which was first introduced by the Israelites at the command of God, but a prehistoric custom that had been in vogue among the Semites from a hoary antiquity, and which has been preserved by the Dhîâb Arabs.

9. The Israelitish account of the origin of firstling blood

[1] In the summer of 1903 I made investigations among the Metâwileh of Belâd Beshara, including Tyre and Jeba', and did not find any use of blood among them.

[2] The Maronites may form an exception, though they shed blood at the launching of ships and boats at Juneh, cf. *Ursemitische Religion*, p. xvi.

[3] The Jews ordinarily deny that they may offer any sacrifices, because of the final destruction of the Temple at Jerusalem under Titus, but the spirit of primitive Semitism is potent among some of them, so that they shed sacrificial blood at the shrine of Eliyâhu. Two young men of the staff of instructors at the Protestant Syrian College in Beirût know of a Jewish student in the Preparatory Department, who had to give up his studies several months for want of funds, who was enabled to return because Jews at Safed paid him for "carrying their sins for them." The young Jew in reporting his good fortune said, "I knew I could not carry their sins, but I thought I might as well have the money as any one.

on the door-posts and lintels of houses is that, in connexion with the Passover festival, the Israelites were directed to put the blood of the Passover lamb on the door-posts and lintels, that Yahwe might see the blood and pass over the houses of the Israelites, when the plague was slaying the firstborn of the Egyptians (Exod. xii. 13 P). The passover festival is a Spring festival. So the Spring sacrifice of the Dhîâb is also a Spring festival. They sprinkle the blood of the sacrifice upon "all the flock, so that God may pass over the flock." In the same way the owner of every tent puts the blood of a victim on the forehead of every boy, so that he may be spared. In like manner the sacrifice for the tent, while the blood is not put on it among the Dhiâb, although it is so placed among the Ruala and many other tribes, is considered a sacrifice for it, so that none of the "dwellers need die." The inhabitants of Kerak, when they cultivate their fields and occupy a cave, offer sacrificial blood at the entrance,[1] the Arabs put blood on a tent when it is pitched for the first time,[2] and Syrians for new houses.[3] The motive for such sacrifices, whether among Israelites, Syrians, or Arabs, is the same. It is that animals and men may suffer no harm. Is such blood primarily vicarious? It seems so. One animal dies that the rest may live, or an animal dies that a man may live. It may well be that the interpretation given by Arabs at Fik, east of the Sea of Galilee, is correct. If the flock becomes diseased, they take all of them and lead them around the maḳâm two or three times. The sheep or goat that goes nearest the maḳâm is used as a sacrifice. They slaughter it, and take some of the blood and put it on the backs of some of the sheep. It is sacrificed to the weli, and spots of blood on the back of the sheep show that they were

[1] *Ursemitische Religion*, p. 208.
[2] *Biblical World*, Chicago, 1904, p. 96.
[3] *Ursemitische Religion*, p. 257.

vowed, and one of them was killed for the others, "one redeemed all," *waḥidah fadat el-kul*, and "her blood was made a cure," i.e., for the rest of the flock, *demha sar shifa*, or her "blood was made healing," reminding us of Isaiah liii. 5, "With his stripes we are healed."

We are not to look to the interpretation of natives in explanation of the significance of sacrifice, but their idea of vicarious death is sometimes startling; e.g., an Arab, about two hours from Ṭafîleh, ancient Tophel (Deut. i. 1), brought out the notion of vicarious suffering: "If you vow for a boy, you take a sheep and redeem him [i.e. the boy] . . . a spirit redeems a spirit: *nafs tafda ʿan nafs*. Because I vowed this vow to you, oh Ḥudêfi, you will accept this offering for the safety of my son, and it is soul for soul: *nafs ʿan nafs*; also, "I take your sin upon my neck," i.e., "I assume your guilt." [1] In all sacrifices where a man puts his hand on the head of the victim, and it is accepted to make atonement for him (Lev. i. 4 P), we seem to have the idea of vicarious death.

I present these two interviews and some Old Testament parallels that I may show what light falls from such survivals on the religious usages of ancient Israel. It may be said, "Have not these tribes derived their customs from a corrupted account of Israelitish institutions?" So it might appear at the first blush. But it is altogether unlikely, when we remember that some of these same customs are found under various forms, from one end of the country to the other, and among all sects, except Protestants, and are attested as existing among the ancient Babylonians.

[1] Cf. The Expositor, London, 1902, p. 458.

Samuel Ives Curtiss.

THE BIBLE STORY OF CREATION—A PHASE OF THE THEISTIC ARGUMENT.[1]

FREE, reverent discussion of the Bible is an absolute necessity for spiritual life. This arises from the fact that the Bible appeals directly to the individual, and to the individual as a being formed in the image of God. It places nothing in the first instance between a man and his Creator; the authority that it claims is the authority of rational conviction. The old divorce that both theology and philosophy made between reason and revelation is a false antithesis, and the faith that has value is that which goes hand in hand with reason.

Hence, the awakened intelligence claims to interpret in the light of reason. It will not accept without in measure understanding why; and when it finds, as it sometimes does, an apparent discrepancy between Truth as presented in Scripture, and the facts of experience (scientific or spiritual), it will not simply ignore experience and lazily acquiesce in authority. It has a higher appreciation of the Author of the world than to believe that He can rend His universe apart and demand here an irrational acquiescence which is contradictory of the result of active, rational investigation there.

Science and Theology—are they antagonistic? Can what is true in one be false in the other? If so, farewell to a whole-hearted allegiance to Truth, and to the dissipation of human anxiety and doubt.

The literature of to-day gives evidence that there are many people disturbed about the truth of the Creation story in the opening chapter of *Genesis*, and uneasy lest their doubt should be reprehensible. They struggle against

[1] Being the Murtle Lecture, delivered in the Mitchell Hall, Marischal College, Aberdeen, on the 17th January, 1904.

light as intellectually apprehended, and the dictates of the heart which would counsel the total cessation of thought; and the result is in every way unnatural and unsatisfactory. A robust religious sense says, "Interrogate, inquire; and the further you push your inquiries, the better for yourselves will it be. Revelation can never be served by smothering intellect. 'Truth, like a torch, the more it's shook it shines.'"

I.

Almost half a century ago, religious belief was greatly agitated in our country by the appearance of a book that is little more than a name to the present generation—I mean *Essays and Reviews.* Elderly people—those whose minds had reached the reflective stage in the early "sixties"—quite well remember the consternation and the indignation that that composite treatise created, and the desperate efforts that were made to meet the veiled attack upon the faith (for so it was conceived) from within the Church itself. Motives, of course, were imputed on all hands, and drastic measures were counselled which, if carried out, would certainly have left a lasting stigma on the religious thought of the time. Fortunately, the controversy, although it led to sectarian persecution, did not break bones, and writers of the essays lived to enjoy high place and preferment (one as Archbishop of Canterbury and another as the head of a great Oxford College), and to become the trusted guides of inquiring minds dissatisfied with stereotyped and unprogressive notions.

Of the Essays and Reviews, perhaps none (with the exception of Jowett's "On the Inspiration of Scripture") aroused a greater interest, or was more eagerly canvassed, than that by Mr. C. W. Goodwin on what he designated "the Mosaic Cosmogony." Mr. Goodwin argued that if the Creation narrative in the opening chapter of *Genesis* is

to be taken as literal, infallible expression of how the formation of the world was effected, it is contradicted by the facts and ever-growing disclosures of geology, and it places science and religion in diametrical antagonism. On the other hand, he maintained that such a mode of interpretation is not the correct one, but that we reach the proper standpoint only when we go back to the principle of Galileo, "that the object of a revelation or divine unveiling of mysteries, must be to teach man things which he is unable and must for ever remain unable to find out for himself; but not physical truths, for the discovery of which he has faculties specially provided by his Creator. Hence it was not unreasonable that, in regard to matters of fact merely, the Sacred Writings should use the common language and assume the common belief of mankind, without purporting to correct errors upon points morally indifferent." In this way, it is left free to us (so Mr. Goodwin argued) to find errors, if we can, in the science of the Scripture narrative; but, finding errors, it is fatuous to attempt to reconcile Scripture with science, as so many had tried to do, or to insist, in the face of facts, that Scripture and geology are in absolute unison. That is the kernel of Mr. Goodwin's position and explains his procedure, which may be summarized in the following sentence from himself:—"Believing, as we do, that if the value of the Bible as a book of religious instruction is to be maintained, it must be not by striving to prove it scientifically exact, at the expense of every sound principle of interpretation, and in defiance of common sense, but by the frank recognition of the erroneous views of nature which it contains, we have put pen to paper to analyze some of the popular conciliation theories."

Mr. Goodwin's criticism, within the limits placed by himself, was complete: each conciliator was shown, like Aaron's rod, to swallow up the others. But this did not silence the conciliators. On the contrary, they only set themselves the

more strenuously to work to revise their science; and soon the rasping of the file was heard from many quarters, and the sound of "busy hammers closing rivets up."

The most popular of the replies (so at least I judge it) was that of Mr. Griffin, who elaborated geological tables (as Hugh Miller had done before him), designed to prove step by step that the strata of the earth harmonized exactly with the evolution of "days" in the Scripture story. That attempt (and the same applies to all similar attempts) was vitiated by two things. In the first place, it had to admit that the Mosaic narrative is not, after all, to be taken literally in the full extent of it, and, in particular, that the creation "days" are not to be understood literally: they are not and they cannot be days of twenty-four hours each. In the next place, it tacitly assumes that the revelations of geology are completed, and that the scientific knowledge at a particular date (say the year 1860, when *Essays and Reviews* appeared) is final. These flaws are fatal. The first is tantamount to allowing that the Mosaic history is not history after all, and so is virtually to give the case away at the beginning; and the second forgets that geological knowledge is constantly progressing, and that conciliators, if they are to benefit by its advance, must be constantly revising their answer—a point that is emphatically pressed home upon us by the circumstance that such a revision was precisely what Mr. Gladstone undertook, in the pages of one of our popular magazines, two decades later, only to be mercilessly criticized by Huxley from the side of science.

Not in that way, then, can difficulties be surmounted. Only when we reach the limit of scientific knowledge in the sphere of geology can we even begin to offer a plausible reconciliation.

A much more hopeful line was taken in the rejoinder made by Dr. Rorison, of Peterhead, who had already dis-

tinguished himself by his papers on "The Three Barriers." It was now seen that the Creation story must be studied apart from prejudices and preconceived opinions, and interpreted in the light of its own structure and declarations. Accordingly, looking to the structure of it, and examining the terminology with care, it became apparent that the Mosaic heptameron, or creative week of seven days, is a whole, inclusive of a whole. While, on the one hand, it declares that the universe is not self-derived and self-subsistent, but is the creation and completed work of God, it maintains, on the other hand, that not only does the universe owe its being to Him, it owes its furnishings or occupants as well. The six work-days are not six successive periods of time, each complete in itself, yet fixed in the order of its occurrence, so that the prior leads up to what follows, but they are an exhaustive inventory of the universe conceived as the result of God's Creatorship. It is as if the writer swept the world with his eye, taking in its parts in successive glances, and seeing in every part and every object that contributed to fill the parts testimony to one and one only truth—viz., "the hand that made us is Divine,"—and then proceeded to enunciate in pictorial language this great thought, following the order that his eye had taken (though not attaching any specific significance to the order), and regarding each glance as exhausting a definite part. Sequence in the exposition there unquestionably is, as there must be sequence in every exposition, on whatsoever subject, that we make: there is order in the presentation of ideas, just as there is order in the lantern slides that illustrate a modern lecture; but the sequence is not chronological but logical, the order is subservient to the writer's end, and that end is to impress upon his readers the one supreme truth that creation implies a Creator, and that the whole world is full of the Creator—He first, He last, He everywhere. Consequently, the creation "days"

simply designate completed views or glances, *and are not successive in time*—which they must have been, had they designated time days or even prolonged periods. *The presentation returns upon itself, and returns for the purpose of filling up the original outline with materials or content.* The first three days give the general outline and traverse the whole universe. Day 1 places the region of light under the Creator ("God said, Let there be light: and there was light"); day 2 puts under His sway the air and the sea ("God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters . . . And God called the firmament Heaven"); day 3 ascribes to His creative power the formation of the Earth and the clothing of it with vegetation ("And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear . . . And God said, Let the earth put forth grass, herb yielding seed, and fruit tree bearing fruit after its kind"). The second three days *re-traverse these same three spheres*, and fill in the details. Day 4 goes back to day 1 and collects the light into centres —sun, moon, and stars ("God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of heaven . . . And God made the two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night. He made the stars also"); day 5 corresponds to day 2, and peoples the waters and the air with marine animals and with birds ("And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly . . . and let fowl fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven"); day 6 is the counterpart of day 3, and replenishes the dry land with terrestrial creatures, including man, and gifting the pre-existing vegetation to them for food ("And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after its kind . . . And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle,

and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth . . . And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb yielding seed . . . to you it shall be for meat: and to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth").

Now, if this be so, it is clear that there is here no geological record—no attempt at teaching science. If the description returns upon itself, that continuity of time is wanting which alone gives meaning to geology and is necessary for evolution. There is simply the literary or pictorial presentation of certain great metaphyical truths that underlie religion—a sublimely poetic account of the fundamental religious dogma that "the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein." It may well be that the world is a "process," with a definite time-history; but that lies outside the writer's conception.

In this there are certain things involved. In the first place, matter is to be conceived as dependent on mind; and neither the material out of which the ordered universe is constructed nor the ordered universe itself is eternal: God alone is eternal, and from Him is derived all that exists; for "what is seen hath not been made out of things which do appear." In the next place, the fulness of the Divine creative energy is insisted on under the symbolism of creative "days" (just as in modern times it might be shown by means of lantern slides). There is nothing that is exempted from the creative fiat: everywhere God's power penetrates, operating here in one way, there in another, here separating elements (light from darkness, the waters above from the waters below, sea from dry land), there fashioning products (the heavenly bodies, terrene and terrestrial things, the lower animals and man); in its operation, it is complete,—"And the heaven and the earth were

finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God finished His work which He had made; and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it: because that in it He rested from all His work which God had created and made." In the last place, the God who is Creator is a personal God—thinking, willing, loving, doing all things with a purpose, for a noble and beneficent end. The language is intensely anthropomorphic, as it behoved to be, inasmuch as it is addressed to man, and man (as here set forth) is the crown of creation and made in the image of God. God is represented, not as a mere impersonal principle or as a cold mental abstraction, but as a living Person, deeply interested in His work and throwing His whole energy into it, viewing every part of it when finished as "good" and pronouncing the whole to be "very good"—a Person, not standing aloof and viewing things with indifference, but stamping Himself on His creation, and eager that His creatures should be bound to Him by indissoluble bonds—a Person, whose thought conceived the world, whose love prompted the production of it, whose will achieved it—an active living power, working for a loving end, and, when the result is reached, resting from His labours that He might be "refreshed."

II.

Such then is the interpretation of the Creation section of *Genesis*: let us now see its significance or value. That will best be found if we attend to how Scripture itself treats the Creation story. We never find it appealing to it as a scientific record, but always using it for its theological and spiritual import. It is made the ground of religious faith, and, consequently, the basis of religious living.

The first application that I observe in Scripture has reference to *practice*. It is given in connexion with the

institution of the Jewish Sabbath. The fourth commandment distinctly lays it down as the reason for "remembering the Sabbath day, to keep it holy" that "in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." In other words, it is here enjoined that the life of man be modelled on the life of God. That is the same thing as saying that man's consciousness of his relation to the Supreme is to be kept alive, and the perception of his dignity as a being formed in God's image realized, by the explicit conforming of his earthly life to the plan of the Divine life. That plan is Work and Rest—a weekly or recurrent reminder, suitable to a finite forgetful being, of the Divine fulness of energy, and a stimulus to us to base our daily conduct on the religious idea. Not mundane concerns are alone to occupy us, not even necessary worldly duties, but these sanctified and ennobled by a reference to the heavenly sanction and to the solemnity and sanctity of human life—work and rest, work rounded off by rest, work issuing in rest, our ordinary avocations elevated and blessed by a constant reference to their deeper spiritual end.

The prototype of the Divine Rest takes a different form in *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. The writer there is arguing in behalf of Christianity that it, and it alone, can give the true rest—here is found the rest, the "Sabbath-rest (σαββατισμὸς)" that "remaineth for the people of God." The Creation story of *Genesis* supplies his fundamental idea, but he gives a special turn to the application of it. He is not thinking, like the fourth commandment, of the contrast between six working days and a day of rest as fitted for the just development of man's character, but of the true nature of spiritual rest, of that Sabbatic peace towards which we are striving—for which the ancient Hebrews strove, but which they did not attain. The Old

Testament had represented it under the figure of a promised inheritance, of the land of Canaan; and Hebrews were prone to think the fulfilment of the promise had been made when Joshua settled the wandering tribes in Palestine. But this superficial notion the writer sweeps aside by pointing to the fact that, long after Joshua's time—in the time of David—God still spoke of the rest as something future. The future, he maintains, had now become present. What Moses could not do, what Joshua failed to accomplish, Christ had effected, and through the everlasting gospel had brought to men the rest that remaineth. "Let us, therefore, give diligence"—that is his practical conclusion—"to enter into that rest, that no man fall after the same example of disobedience."

But the Creation story has not only practical worth to the Bible writers, it has also *emotional* value. I need only refer to the book of *Psalms*, and to the use that the sweet singers of Israel make of it. It will be enough for my purpose if I adduce two leading Creation psalms—the eighth and the one hundred and fourth. The eighth psalm is a choice song of thanksgiving, extolling the excellency of the Lord because of His creative power as manifested in the heavens, but still more because of the high place He has assigned to man among the works of creation, "having made him but a little lower than God, and crowned him with glory and honour" and having given him dominion over the works of His hand, and, more especially, over the lower animals. It is essentially a paean on man's dignity—to be specifically referred, later on, by the writer of *Hebrews*, directly to Jesus Christ as the perfect or ideal Man.[1] Psalm 104 is also a psalm of creation, but still more, perhaps, of continual Divine preservation; the original story in *Genesis* being expanded by poetic touches suggested by the writer's own experience of the actual world,

[1] See Chapter II.

and supplemented by striking reference to God's sustaining power manifested everywhere in the world of life and action. In each case (both in Psalm 8 and here), we have a hymn of praise and adoration, framed for the worship of the sanctuary and designed to minister to the spiritual needs of those who use it. Although the first chapter of *Genesis* affords a basis for both, it is not a scientific but a poetic and devotional basis; and points from the original Creation story are selected by each of the sacred writers—such as are conformable to the mood in which he finds himself, and to the purpose he has in view. No literal reproduction of the narrative itself is in either case contemplated; but an adaptation of it suitable for devotion and the ends of religion.[1]

Not yet, however, is the Bible use of the Creation section of *Genesis* exhausted. Practice and emotion must be ministered to, but metaphysics and dogma are also essential to man's spiritual health and welfare. And so *dogma, metaphysics, theological doctrine* are evolved from it. The point specially fixed upon is, of necessity, the Creator Himself and the nature of the Divine energy. "In the beginning God created." Through what means? by whose agency? The answer to this question is given more vaguely, yet with graphic portraiture, by the Old Testament; explicitly and fully, with great sublimity and grandeur, by the New.

The solution of the Old Testament is found mainly in the Sapiential writings; more especially, in the book of *Proverbs*, and there pre-eminently in the eighth chapter. This is the *locus classicus* for the Hebrew doctrine of

[1] The same holds also (I may mention in passing) of the poetic book of Job. Where the emotion is highest, the Creation reference becomes most explicit. It is when the Lord answers Job out of the whirlwind (chapter 38) that the culminating point of awe and, therefore, of veneration is reached; and the effect is produced by directing the thoughts to "the beginning"—when the foundations of the earth were laid, "when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy."

Kochmah or Wisdom, which so magnificently foreshadowed that of the Divine Logos.

> The Lord possessed me as the beginning of His way,
> The first of His works of old.
> I was set up from of old, from the beginning,
> Or ever the earth was:
> When there were no depths, I was brought forth,
> When there were no fountains abounding with water.
> Before the mountains were settled,
> Before the hills was I brought forth.
> While as yet He had not made the earth, nor the fields,
> Nor the beginning of the dust of the world.
> When He set up the heavens, I was there,
> When He drew a circle upon the face of the deep.
> When He made firm the skies above,
> When the fountains of the deep became strong.
> When He gave to the sea His decree,
> That the waters should not transgress His commandment,
> When He marked out the foundations of the earth:
> Then I was by Him as a master workman,
> And day by day was I (full of) delights,
> Playing before Him at all times;
> Playing in His habitable earth,
> And my delights were with the sons of men.[1]

In that splendid passage, we have "the Spirit of God" of the original story—the same that "brooded upon the face of the waters"—personified as the Divine Thought—uncreate, yet begotten, and represented as the primal movement of the Divine Activity: first, begotten before all else; next, revelling in its creative energy, yet looking to God Himself for its being, and *sporting* "before Him," delighting to effect His purpose and to achieve His highest idea—viz., "the habitable earth" and "the sons of men." There is development here of the original conception, and the trend is obviously in the direction of the New Testament, and, more especially, of the Personal Word or Logos of St. John.

[1] Mainly Prof. A. B. Davidson's translation. See EXPOSITOR, 1st series, vol. xii. p. 455.

At the opening of the Prologue of St. John's Gospel, we read (using, for greatest clearness, the oldest punctuation—that of Tatian—and translating accordingly): "In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him; and without Him was not anything made. That which hath been made (ὃ γέγονεν) was life in Him; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in the darkness; and the darkness apprehended it not." And, further on in the Prologue, we find, "the Logos became flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld His glory, glory as of the only-begotten from the Father), full of grace and truth."

Clearly, in this we have the just complement of the Wisdom section of *Proverbs*; but not less clearly have we here the just complement of the opening section of *Genesis*: it is a re-reading of the Creation story, with a deepened interpretation. Both in *Genesis* and here, we are transported to "the beginning," when creative work had to be done ("In the beginning God created"—"In the beginning was the Logos"); in both, the language is fitly wedded to the conceptions, producing on the reader an impression that is absolutely unique; in both, we hear the distant roll of thunder—all the more impressive that it is subdued.

The same thought is taken up in the introductory verses of *Hebrews*, which form a magnificent summary of the whole teaching of the Epistle, where the writer speaks of "the Son" as the agent "through whom also God made the world," and presents Him in a bold figure as the great Atlas bearing the world on His shoulders—"*upholding* (φέρων) all things by the word of His power." And, then, when, at the close of Scripture, a door is opened in heaven to the Seer of Patmos, the sight that greets him is that of the four and twenty elders "falling down before Him that sitteth on the throne, and worshipping Him that liveth for

ever and ever, and casting their crowns before the throne, saying, Worthy art Thou, our Lord and our God, to receive the glory and the honour and the power: for Thou didst create all things, and because of Thy will they were, and were created."

And so we see the significance that is attached to the Creation story by Scripture itself; the Bible ending as it began. It is used purely for edification—partly to aid the believer's conduct, partly to stimulate his devotion, and partly to serve as the vehicle of still higher Revelation, disclosing to him his own nature, and imparting such a knowledge of God as would best conduce to his spiritual development and his religious advance.

III.

Two conclusions inevitably suggest themselves, each of practical importance.

In the first place, if the opening section of *Genesis* is not literal history, but a sublime parable, dealing with the ground-principle of existence, enunciating the deep truth of the unity of the world (the fact that it is a universe, an ordered whole, a *cosmos*, a *mundus*, a *tebhel*), and of the relation between man and his Maker, then we need be little troubled by the alleged antagonism between the Creation story and modern science. Irreconcilable contradiction there can be none: the one deals with the facts of Nature (analyzing, generalizing, methodizing, synthesizing), and the other with the religious interpretation of the facts, which of necessity must be also metaphysical—a different matter, but not in any way opposed.

In the next place, if the significance of the Creation story be as I have maintained, then the opening section of *Genesis* becomes the very basis of our religion—the foundation on which the superstructure is reared. Remove this, and the building falls. The Old Testament and the New

are a unity, and "*re*-creation" looks back to, and is dependent on, "creation." Both repose on the personality and creatorship of God, on His sovereignty over, and His interest in, the universe that owes its existence and its continued being to Him, on His intense concern for the creatures of His hand, and, more especially, for man, whom He formed in His own image.[1] It is only if God did at the beginning "command the light to shine out of darkness" that He "hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." The second is inseparably bound up with the first, and the two stand or fall together. The scheme of the Revealed Word is one; and the faith of the Christian should also be one—it should be like the garment of our Lord, "without seam, woven from the top throughout."

WILLIAM L. DAVIDSON.

[1] The Creation song of *Revelation* is that of the four and twenty elders —i.e., of "the glorious company" of the twelve *Jewish* patriarchs and the twelve *Christian* apostles.

THE LIFE OF CHRIST ACCORDING TO ST. MARK.[1]

XXIII. The Mission of the Twelve, VI. 7–30.

We read some time since that the Twelve were appointed that they might preach; but so far nothing has been said of any such activity on their part. In the interval, however, Jesus had been training them, for instance He had privately explained to them the parables. Now they were sent out two by two that the preaching of the Kingdom might be multiplied sevenfold. Jesus no doubt intended that His message should be proclaimed in every town and village of Palestine. Perhaps He felt that His otherworldliness placed barriers between Him and ordinary men; the disciples being more practical might be better able to reach the hearts of the people.

The burden of the apostolic preaching, like that of John the Baptist, and of Jesus, was that men should repent. Moreover the apostles were invested with the power to cast out demons, and to heal diseases—the marvellous gifts of Jesus were, so to speak, contagious. When the disciples wished to cure any one they anointed the sufferer with oil, a common remedy, and probably used as such and not merely as a piece of ritual. This combination of ordinary means with the operation of special gifts of healing shows that the Evangelist did not draw any sharp distinction between the natural and the supernatural.

[1] These studies do not profess to be an adequate historical and doctrinal account of Christ, but are an attempt to set forth the impression which St. Mark's account of our Lord would make on a reader whose only source of information was the Second Gospel, and who knew nothing of Christian dogmatics.

The Gospel cites some of the instructions given by the Master; the disciples were to take with them only a staff and what they stood upright in; they were to be dependent on casual hospitality for food and shelter; they were not to be fastidious as to their entertainment, but throughout their stay at any place they were to remain at the house which first received them—a provision which would prevent them from staying long in one village, since the chance guest was expected to depart on the third day, counting the day of arrival as the first. As hospitality was a recognized duty there was nothing extraordinary about such instructions; and they are probably recorded as a precedent for early Christian Evangelists.

Little is said as to the results of the Mission, and from this silence we may gather that the preaching of the Twelve was a failure—a failure that is to say in the judgment of Jesus and in the light of later history; it did not serve as a positive preparation for the Kingdom. Yet the Mission was not useless; individuals were won; and further progress was made in that proclamation to Israel which was a necessary preliminary of the Coming of the Kingdom. Hence Jesus bade the apostles shake off the dust from their feet against the towns which did not receive them, as a sign that the royal heralds had done their duty, and that the blood of the obdurate was upon their own heads.

But in the eyes of men the preaching seemed successful, it made Jesus more widely known, and the cures wrought by the apostles enhanced, his fame. Jesus, it seemed was carrying out a systematic plan by which all Galilee, perhaps all Syria, would be brought under His influence. How would he use that influence? St. Mark felt that the Mission was a crisis in His career; he interrupts the narrative to tell us what men thought of Him. "His name," we read, "had become known"; and as usual men were

specially impressed by the miracles. Some said that He was a prophet like one of the ancient messengers of God; Israel had long mourned its lack of prophets, and now in Jesus the good old times had come again. Others ascribed to Him the unique position of Elijah restored to life. The final word in the record of prophecy was often understood to be a promise that Elijah would return as the forerunner of the Messiah. If any one objected that John the Baptist had announced himself as the Forerunner, there was an obvious answer: Jesus *was* John the Baptist, risen from the dead. It was this last answer which commended itself to the guilty conscience of Herod, who had put John to death. A popular belief that Jesus was a reincarnation, so to speak, of the Baptist shows that He did not become publicly famous till after John's death, and that the public generally knew nothing of His early life.

It is most striking that, in spite of His miracles, His popularity, and His impressive character, no one seems to have thought that Jesus could be the Messiah—except the demoniacs.

XXIV. The Feeding of the Five Thousand, VI. 31–44.

The disciples had discharged their commission with zeal, and were tired with journeying, preaching, and the emotional strain involved in healing the sick and casting out demons; and, as had happened once before, Jesus and His followers were so beset that they had not leisure even to eat. On that former occasion Jesus continued His work indifferent to hunger and weariness, but He was more careful for His disciples than He had been for Himself. "Come apart," said He, with His usual gracious kindliness, "into some quiet place and rest." So they went away in their boat to seek some lonely spot. It is not easy

to make out the geography, but it seems that the rendezvous of Jesus and the disciples after the Mission was somewhere on the western coast of the lake, not far from its northern end, and that they sailed across some short distance to the eastern side. But they did not escape unobserved, and the people followed them along the shore, so that, when they landed, a great crowd had already gathered to meet them. As usual the sense of their spiritual need came to Jesus as an irresistible appeal, and he began to teach them many things; the day wore on; the discourse showed no sign of coming to an end, and still the crowd hung upon His lips. But the more practical disciples became anxious about food for such a multitude, and suggested that Jesus should send them away that they might provide for themselves in the neighbouring villages.

The sequel is only partly intelligible. At the bidding of Jesus, the disciples distributed to the crowd their own small store, five loaves and two small fishes; and the hunger of that great multitude, five thousand men beside women and children, was satisfied. How, we are not told, and conjecture is useless in a matter where it is possible that no illumination can be derived from ordinary experience.

XXV. The Walking on the Water, VI. 45–56.

When the meal was ended, Jesus sent His disciples back in the boat to the western shore, while He Himself dismissed His guests. When they were gone He betook Himself alone into the solitude of the hills to pray. These special seasons of retirement for fellowship with God were associated with crises in the life of Jesus. It was after the Baptism that He withdrew into the wilderness; He sought some lonely place for prayer after the first exercise, probably the discovery of His marvellous gifts, i.e., after He

had cleansed the demoniac in the Synagogue at Capernaum, and had healed Peter's mother-in-law. Now these evening hours were His first leisure since the disciples had given Him the report of their mission, and had afforded Him fresh evidence that Israel would probably reject His message. Moreover we have seen that the mighty works of Jesus were not wrought without cost to Himself. The Feeding of the Five Thousand was so strange an event that the Evangelist cannot find words to describe it clearly. Its circumstances and its sequel may well have involved some wonderful experience for Jesus, including perhaps some new light as to the character and disposition of the people and of His own disciples ; some new light that gave Him pause and called for reflection on the end to which His work was tending. Hence, in the privacy of night in the lonely hills He surrendered Himself to the fellowship of God that He might understand His life and the Father's purpose concerning Him. He knelt to share

> " The silence of eternity,
> Interpreted by love."

Meanwhile the disciples were making small progress in their voyage, for they were labouring at the oars against contrary winds ; and St. Mark tells us that towards dawn Jesus came to them walking on the sea ; and they thought that they saw a ghost, and were frightened ; but He reassured them, and went up into the boat, and the wind ceased. St. Mark goes on to tell us that they were astonished, because they did not understand about the loaves, but their hearts were hardened. It seems that the Feeding of the Five Thousand was a mystery even to the ministers of the feast. Had they understood, St. Mark seems to imply, they would not have been astonished at the further wonder of the Walking on the Sea. To the Evangelist that mysterious feast was an exceptional proof

of miraculous power, but it does not seem to have made the same impression on the disciples who were eye-witnesses. This fact and the obscurity of some features in the story suggest that at this point St. Mark was not so well informed as usual, and that he obtained the account indirectly from tradition.

The concluding verses of this section tell us how Jesus was again beset by crowds seeking to be healed: probably a consequence of these new marvels.

XXVI. The Traditions of the Elders, VII. 1–23.

The last few sections have dealt with incidents which added to the fame and influence of Jesus, and therefore stimulated the hostility of His opponents. We now find Him in collision with certain Pharisees reinforced, as on previous occasions, by Scribes from Jerusalem; and, as usual, they were the assailants; Jesus did not spontaneously denounce them, but they attacked the disciples, and in defending His followers Jesus was led to repudiate the Pharisaic doctrine.

In this case the cause of offence was neglect of ceremonial washings before meals, a sin which was not due to the teaching of Jesus, but to the natural carelessness of fishermen and peasants. Had they continued fishermen the Pharisees would not have troubled about the master; but the disciples were now the chosen friends of a religious leader, and they had recently been preaching themselves. It was scandalous that they should neglect forms observed by all religious folk; to use a modern parallel, it was like a minister omitting to say grace.

The scribes then had noticed that some of the disciples did not wash their hands before a meal, and they came to Jesus for an explanation of such laxity. Somehow the

demand roused Him to one of His rare outbursts of indignation. He addressed these cavilling informers as hypocrites; their anxiety for an explanation and their zeal for the traditions were alike insincere, cloaks for the personal animosity of the fanatic towards those who differ from him. Jesus applied to them Isaiah's description of the Jews of his own time—

"This people honour me with their lips, but their heart is far from me; they offer me useless worship, for they teach mere human precepts."

Further, their insincerity was shown by the fact that some of their cherished traditions were inconsistent with the law itself; so that while they professed to be zealous for the Divine ordinances, they rejected the commandments of God that they might keep the traditions of men; or, in other words, the professed champions of the Bible were its worst enemies. For instance, Moses bade a man honour his father and mother, but according to tradition a man might let his parents starve if he devoted his property to God.

This incident affords a striking illustration of the points at issue between Jesus and the Pharisees. Neither the washing of hands before every meal nor the maintenance of parents in old age are expressly laid down in the Pentateuch; but both are legitimate inferences from what is laid down. If the eating of unclean food was an evil to be avoided at any cost, the hands must be washed before every meal, for the chances were that the hands had contracted some ceremonial uncleanness which would communicate itself to the food, unless it were removed by washing. Similarly the command to honour parents implied the relief of their destitute old age. But it would be impossible to press all the multitudinous ordinances of the Pentateuch to their extreme logical implications; some of these would soon be found to clash with one another. More especially

the development of humanitarian precepts would soon be checked by the exaggeration of ceremonial demands. Which was to give way? Wherein could man's love to God be best shown? In the external observance of sacred acts and seasons, in reverence for sacred places and officials, or in service to neighbours and kinsfolk. The Pharisee claimed that ritual ordinances as to cleanness, the Sabbath, and so forth were to be maintained at any sacrifice; but according to Jesus, the dictates of humanity and the claims of natural affection took precedence of such demands.

This encounter prompted Jesus to make a public declaration, which widened the breach between Him and the legalists. Jesus had already broken with Pharisaic tradition, but hitherto He had in no way explicitly challenged any of the Mosaic ordinances as given in the Pentateuch. Now He called the multitude to Him, and declared that men were not defiled by anything from without, but by that which came from within. These words seem clear enough, but they were so startling that the disciples could hardly believe their own ears. When they were alone with Jesus, they asked Him what He meant. He then said plainly that a man is not defiled by what he takes unto him, i.e. by food, but the words and acts which proceed from him. St. Mark adds the comment that thus Jesus made all foods clean, i.e. He revoked the Mosaic Laws as to clean and unclean meats. He could not intend that His followers should at once abandon the ordinances as to food, but He regarded them as mere matters of custom and expedience which had no religious value.

This episode was critical both for Jesus and for Christianity. It secured for the Church independence of Judaism, and on the part of Jesus it involved a larger claim of authority, and a more hopeless breach with current orthodoxy. From the outset Jesus set His authority above that

of the Pharisees, He now asserted His right to overrule Moses. It was due to the recognition of this claim that the Christian Church did not remain a Jewish sect, but became an independent organization.

W. H. Bennett.

CHARACTERISTICS OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

III.

We proceed to examine the history of the vernacular Common Greek. Some features of its development are undoubted, and may be noted first. The impulse which produced it is, beyond question, the work of Alexander the Great. The unification of Hellas was a necessary first step in the accomplishment of his dream of Hellenizing the world which he had marked out for conquest. To achieve unity of speech throughout the little country which his father's diplomatic and military triumphs had virtually conquered for him, was a task too serious for Alexander himself to face. But unconsciously he achieved it, as a by-result of his colossal schemes, and the next generation found that not only had a common language emerged from the chaos of Hellenic dialects, but a new and nearly homogeneous world-speech had been created, in which Persian and Egyptian might do business together, and Roman proconsuls issue their commands to the subjects of a mightier empire than Alexander's own. His army was in itself a powerful agent in the levelling process which ultimately destroyed nearly all the Greek dialects. The Anabasis of the Ten Thousand Greeks, seventy years before, had doubtless done something of the same kind on a small scale. Clearchus the Lacedaemonian, Menon the Thessalian, Socrates the Arcadian, Proxenus the Boeotian, and the rest, would find it difficult to preserve their native brogue very long free from the solvent influences of perpetual association during their march; and when Cheirisophus of Sparta and Xenophon of Athens had safely brought the host home, it is not strange that the historian himself had suffered in the purity of his Attic, which has some peculiarities distinctly foreshadowing

the *Κοινή*.[1] The assimilating process would, of course, go much further in the camp of Alexander, where, during prolonged campaigns, men from all parts of Greece were tent-fellows and messmates, with no choice but to accommodate their dialect in its more individual characteristics to the average Greek which was gradually being evolved among their comrades. In this process naturally those features which were peculiar to a single dialect would have the smallest chance of surviving, and those which most successfully combined the characteristics of many dialects would be surest of a place in the resultant "common speech." The process was of course only begun in the army. As Hellenism swept victoriously into Asia, and established itself on all the shores of the eastern Mediterranean, the mixture of nationalities in the new-rising communities demanded a common language as the medium of intercourse, and the Greek of the victorious armies of Alexander was ready for the purpose. In the country districts of Greece itself, the dialects lived on for generations; but Greece mattered comparatively little by this time for the great Hellenising movement to which the world was to owe so much, nor were the dialects which strikingly differed from the new *Κοινή* those spoken by races that counted for anything in the movement. History gives an almost pathetic interest to an inscription like that from Larissa, engraved at the end of the third century B.C., where the citizens record a rescript from King Philip V., and their own consequent resolutions :—[2]

Ταγευόντουν Ἀναγκίπποι Πετθαλείοι κ.τ.λ., Φιλίπποι τοῖ

[1] Cf. Rutherford, *New Phrynichus*, 160–174. The same may be said of the language of the lower classes in Athens herself in the fifth century B.C., consisting as they did of immigrants from all parts. So [Xenophon] *Constitution of Athens* 11. 3:—"The Greeks have an individual dialect, and manner of life and fashion of their own, but the Athenians have what is compounded from all the Greeks and barbarians." The vase-inscriptions abundantly evidence this. (Kretschmer, *Entstehung d.* Κοινή, p. 34.)

[2] See Michel, *Recueil d'Inscriptions Grecques*, no. 41, or other collections.

βασιλεῖος ἐπιστολὰν ἀπυστέλλαντος πὸτ τὸς ταγὸς καὶ τὰν πόλιν τὰν ὑπογεγραμμέναν·

Βασιλεὺς Φίλιππος Λαρισαίων τοῖς ταγοῖς καὶ τῇι πόλει χαίρειν (and so on in normal *Κοινή*).

The old and the new survived thus side by side into the imperial age, but Christianity had only a brief opportunity of speaking in the old dialects of Greece. In one corner alone did the dialect live on. To-day scholars recognize but one modern idiom, the Zaconian, which does not directly descend from the *Κοινή*. As we might expect, this is nothing but the ancient Laconian, whose broad *ā* holds its ground still in the speech of a race impervious to literature and proudly conservative of a dialect that was always abnormal to an extreme. Apart from this the dialects died out entirely. They contributed their share to the resultant common Greek, but it is an assured result of Modern Greek philology that there are no elements whatever now existing, due to the ancient dialects, which did not find their way into the stream of development through the channel of the Common Dialect of more than two thousand years ago.

So far we may go without difference of opinion. The only serious discussion arises when we ask what were the relative magnitudes of the contributions of the several dialects to the new resultant speech. That the literary *Κοινή* was predominantly Attic has been already stated, and is of course beyond doubt. But was Attic more than one among many elements assimilated in the new vernacular? It has always been taken for granted that the intellectual queen of Greece was the predominant partner in the business of establishing a new dialect based on compromise between the old ones. This conclusion has recently been challenged by Dr. Paul Kretschmer, a brilliant comparative philologist, previously distinguished for his studies on the language of the Greek vase-inscriptions and on the dialects

of the Greeks' nearest neighbours.[1] In his tractate entitled *Die Entstehung der Κοινή*, published in the Transactions of the Vienna Academy for 1900, he undertook to show that the oral *Κοινή* contained elements from Boeotian, Ionic and even North-west Greek to a larger extent than from Attic. His argument affects pronunciation mainly. That Boeotian monophthongizing of the diphthongs, Doric softening of β, δ and γ, and Ionic deaspiration of words beginning with *h*, affected the spoken language more than any Attic influence, might perhaps be allowed. But if we restrict ourselves to features which had to be represented in writing, as contrasted with mere variant pronunciations of the same written word, the case becomes less striking. Boeotian may have supplied 3 plur. forms in *-σαν* for imperfect and optative, but they do not appear to any considerable extent outside the LXX.: the New Testament probably knows them not, and they are surprisingly rare in the papyri.[2] North-west Greek has the accusative plural in *-ες*, found freely in papyri and (in the word *τέσσαρες*) in MSS. of the New Testament; also the middle conjugation of *εἰμί*, and the confusion of forms from *-άω* and *-έω* verbs. Doric gives us some guttural forms from verbs in *-ζω*, and a few lexical items. Ionic supplies a fair number of isolated forms, and may be responsible for many *-ω* or *-ῶ* flexions from *-μι* verbs, and some uncontracted noun-forms like *ὀστέων* or *χρυσέῳ*. But the one peculiarly Attic feature which Kretschmer does allow, the treatment of original *ā* as contrasted with Ionic on one side and the rest of Greek dialects on the other, is so far-reaching in its effects that we cannot but give it more weight than any of the rest. And while the accidence of Attic may bequeath to the vernacular much matter which it shared with other dialects, one may ques-

[1] *Die griech. Vaseninschriften*, 1894; *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griech. Sprache*, 1896.

[2] See *Class. Rev.* xv. 36, and the addenda in xviii. 110 (March 1904).

tion whether the accidence of any single dialect would present anything like the same similarity to that of the *Κοινή* as the Attic does. We can hardly resist the conclusion of the experts that Kretschmer has failed to prove his point. At the same time we may allow that the influence of the other dialects on pronunciation may well have been generally underestimated. Kretschmer of course declares that Attic supplied the orthography, except for those uneducated persons to whom we are so much indebted for evidence of pronunciation. Consequently, he says, when the Hellenist wrote *χαίρει* and pronounced it *chéri*, his language was really Boeotian and not Attic.[1] It is obvious that the question does not seriously concern us, since we are dealing with a language which for all its vernacular character comes to us in a written and therefore largely Atticized form. For our purpose we may assume that we have a Greek which includes important contributions from various dialects, but with Attic as the principal factor, although we have hardly anything in it in which Attic showed a marked idiosyncrasy.

At this point it should be observed that pronunciation is not to be passed over as a matter of no practical importance for the modern student of Hellenistic. The undeniable fact that phonetic spelling—which during the reign of the old dialects was a blessing common to all—was entirely abandoned by the educated generations before the Christian era, has some very obvious results for our grammar and textual criticism. That *αι* and *ε*, *ει* (*η*) and *ι*, *οι* and *υ* were identities for the scribes of our MSS. is certain.[2] The scribe made his choice according to the grammar and the

[1] Against this emphasizing of Boeotian, see Thumb, *Hellenismus*, 228.

[2] On the date of the levelling of quantity, so notable a feature in Modern Greek, see Hatzidakis in *Ἀθηνᾶ* for 1901 (xiii. 247). He decides that it began outside Greece and established itself very gradually. It must have been complete, or nearly so, before the scribes of ℵ B wrote.

sense, just as we choose between *kings*, *king's* and *kings'*, or between *bow* and *bough*. He wrote σύ nominative and σοί dative; λύσασθαι infinitive and λύσασθε imperative; φιλεῖς, εἶδον indicative, and φιλῇς, ἴδω subjunctive; βούλει verb, but βουλῇ noun. But there was nothing to prevent him from writing ἐξέφνης, ἐφνίδιος, ἀφειρημένος, etc., if his antiquarian knowledge gave in; while there were times when his choice between (for example) infinitive and imperative (as Luke xix. 13) was determined only by his own or perhaps a traditional exegesis. It will be seen therefore that we cannot regard our best MSS. as decisive on such questions, except as far as we may see reason to trust their general accuracy in grammatical tradition. Westcott and Hort may be justified in printing ἵνα . . . ἐπισκιάσει in Acts v. 15, after B and some cursives; but the passage is wholly useless for any argument as to the use of ἵνα with a future. Or, let us take the constructions of οὐ μή as exhibited in Moulton-Geden's concordance (for W.H. *text*). There are 73 occurrences with aor. subj., and 2 more in which the -σω might theoretically be future. Against these we find 8 cases of the future, and 14 in which the parsing depends on our choice between ει and η. It is evident that editors cannot hope to decide here what the autographs had. And if they had the autograph before them, it would be no evidence as to the author's grammar if he dictated the text. To this we may add that by the time ℵ and B were written ο and ω were no longer distinct in pronunciation, which transfers two more cases to the indeterminate list. It is not therefore simply the overwhelming manuscript authority which decides us for ἔχωμεν in Rom. v. 1. Were the versions and the patristic authorities wanting, we might have some difficulty in proving that the orthography of the MSS. went back to a very ancient traditional interpretation. It is indeed quite possible that the Apostle's own pronunciation did not distinguish them sufficiently to give Tertius a clear lead

without making inquiry.[1] In all these matters we may fairly recognize a case nearly parallel with the editor's choice between such alternatives as τίνες and τινές in Heb. iii. 16, where the tradition varies. The modern expositor feels himself entirely at liberty to decide according to his view of the context.

Before passing on from the dialect question it may be well to make a few more remarks on the nature of the contributions which we have noted. Some surprise may have been felt at the importance of the elements alleged to have been brought into the language by the "North-west Greek,"[2] a dialect which lies altogether outside the literary limits. The group embraces, as its main constituents, the dialects of Epirus, Ætolia, Locris and Phokis and Achaia and is known to us from inscriptions, in which those of Delphi are conspicuous. It is the very last we should have expected to influence the resultant language, but it is soon observed that its part (on Kretschmer's theory) has really been very marked. The characteristic Achaian accus. plur. in -ες successfully established itself in the common Greek, as its presence in the vernacular of to-day sufficiently shows. Its prominence in the papyri[3] indicates that it was making a good fight, which in the case of τέσσαρες had already become a fairly assured victory. In the New Testament, τέσσαρας never occurs without some excellent authority for τέσσαρες:[4] cf. W.H. App. 150. Moreover I note in Rev. i. 16 that A has ἀστέρες—with omission of ἔχων,

[1] ο and ω were confused in various quarters before this date: cf Schweizer, *Pergam.* 95; Nachmanson, *Magnet. Inschr.* 64; Thumb, *Hellenismus*, 143.

[2] Brugmann, *Griech. Gram.*[3] 17.

[3] See *Class. Rev.* xv. 34, 435, xviii, 109. I must acknowledge a curious mistake I made there in citing A. Thumb for instead of against Kretschmer's argument on this point.

[4] John xi. 17 ℵ Δ; Acts xxvii. 29 and Rev. ix. 14, ℵ; Rev. iv. 4 ℵ A (and so W.H. marg.); vii. 1 A *bis*, P *semel*.

it is true, but that may well be an effort to mend the grammar. It is of course impossible to build on this; but taking into account the obvious fact that the author of the Apocalypse was still decidedly *ἀγράμματος* at Greek; and remembering the already described phenomena of the papyri, I should be greatly surprised if his autograph did not exhibit accusatives in *-ες*, and not in *τέσσαρες* alone. The middle conjugation of *εἰμί* is given by Kretschmer as a North-west Greek feature, but the Delphian *ἦται* and *ἔωνται* are balanced by Messenian *ἦνται* and Lesbian *ἔσσο*, which looks as if some middle forms existed in the earliest Greek. But the confusion of the *-άω* and *-έω* verbs, which is marked in the papyri[1] and New Testament and is complete in Modern Greek, may well have come from the North-west Greek, though encouraged by Ionic. I cannot attempt to discuss here the question between Thumb and Kretschmer, but an *à priori* argument might be pleaded for the latter in the well-known fact that from the third to the first century B.C. the political importance of Ætolia and Achaia produced an Achaian-Dorian *Κοινή*, which yielded to the other *Κοινή* about a hundred years before St. Paul began to write: it seems antecedently probable that this dialect would leave some traces on that which superseded it. Possibly the extension of the 3rd plur. *-σαν*, and even the perfect *-αν*, may be due to the same source[2]: the former is also Boeotian. The features we have been mentioning have in common their *sporadic* acceptance in the first century Hellenistic, which is just what we should expect where a dialect like this contends for survival with one that has already spread over a very large area. The elements here tentatively set down to the North-west Greek secured their ultimate victory through their intrinsic advantages. One (*-άω* and *-έω* verbs)

[1] See *Class. Rev.* xv. 36, 435, xviii. 110.

[2] It is found in Delphian (Valaori, *Delph. Dial.* 60) rather prominently both in indic. and opt. The case for *-αν* (*ibid.*) is weaker.

fused together two grammatical categories which served no useful purpose by their distinctness; another (accus. in -ες) reduced the number of separate forms to be remembered, at the cost of a confusion which English bears without difficulty, and even Attic bore in πόλεις, βασιλεῖς, πλείους, etc.; while the others both reduced the tale of equivalent suffixes and (in the case of -σαν) provided a very useful means of distinction between 1st sing. and 3rd plur.

We come to securer ground when we bring in the part taken by Ionic, for here Thumb and Kretschmer are at one. The former observes that only the establishment of an entirely new type can be conclusive for our recognition of a particular dialect as the source of some modern phenomenon. The nouns in -ᾶς -ᾶδος and -οῦς -οῦδος are by this principle recognized as an undeniable debt of Modern Greek to Ionic elements in the *Κοινή*. Like the other elements which came from a single ancient dialect, they had to struggle for existence. We find them in the Egyptian Greek, but in the New Testament -ᾶς makes gen. -ᾶ, as often even in Asia Minor, where naturally -ᾶδος is at home.[1] Kretschmer gives as Ionic elements in the *Κοινή* the forms κιθών (=χιτών) and the like, psilosis (which the Ionians shared with their Æolic neighbours), the uncontracted noun and verb forms alluded to already, and the invasion of the -μι verbs by thematic forms (contract or ordinary). He does not accept the declension σπεῖρα σπείρης, normal in the *Κοινή* from the first century B.C., as due to Ionism, but to the analogy of γλῶσσα γλώσσης. To his argument here we might add the consideration that the declension -ρᾰ -ρης is both earlier and more stable than -νῖα -νίης, a difference which I would connect with the fact that the combination ιη was barred in Attic at a time when ρη (from ρϝᾱ) was no longer objected to (contrast ὑγιᾶ and κόρη): if Ionic forms

[1] It is in a minority both at Pergamon and at Magnesia: Schweizer 139 f., Nachmanson, 120.

were simply taken over, εἰδυίης would have come in as early as σπείρης.

But this discussion may be left to the philological journals, for we must endeavour to bring the generalities to a close to make way for a survey of the syntax in its several divisions. What concerns the student of the written vernacular is rather the question of dialectic varieties in itself than in its previous history. Are we to expect persistence of Ionic features in Asia Minor, and will the Greek of Egypt, Syria, Macedonia and Italy differ dialectically to an extent which we can detect after two thousand years? Speaking generally, we may reply in the negative. Dialectic differences there must have been in a language spoken over so large an area. But the differences need not in theory be greater than those between British and American English, which when written conceal the main differences, those of pronunciation. The analogy of this modern *Weltsprache* is in fact very helpful for our investigation of the old. We see how the educated colloquial closely approximates everywhere when written down, differing locally to some extent, but in vocabulary and orthography rather than in grammar. The uneducated vernacular will differ more, but its differences will still show least in the grammar. The study of the papyri and the *Κοινή* inscriptions of Asia Minor shows us that we have essentially the same phenomena in Hellenistic. There are few points of grammar in which the New Testament language differs from that which we see in other sources of common Greek vernacular, from whatever province it comes. We have already mentioned cases in which what may have been quite possible Hellenistic is used beyond the limits of natural Greek because of coincidence with Semitic. Apart from these, we have a few small matters in which the New Testament differs from the usage of the Papyri. The prominence of οὐ μή is the most important of these, for certainly the papyri lend no countenance whatever to any

theory that *οὐ μή* was a normal unemphatic negative in Hellenistic. I must return to this when the negatives come to be discussed; but meanwhile I may note that in the New Testament *οὐ μή* seems somehow necessarily connected with "translation Greek"—the places where no Semitic original can be suspected show it only in the very emphatic sense which is common to classical and Hellenistic use. Among smaller points are the New Testament construction of *ἔνοχος*, c. gen. of penalty, and the prevailing use of *ἀπεκρίθην* for *ἀπεκρινάμην*: in both of these the papyri agree with the classical usage, but that in the latter case the New Testament has good Hellenistic warrant is shown by Phrynichus (see Rutherford, p. 186 ff.), and by the modern Greek *ἀποκρίθηκα*.

The whole question of dialectic differences within the spoken *Κοινή* is judicially summed up by our greatest living authority, Dr. Albert Thumb, in chap. v. of his book on Greek in the Hellenistic age, already often quoted. He thinks that such differences must have existed largely, in Asia Minor especially, but that writings like the Greek Bible, intended for wider circulation, employed a *Durchschnittsprache* which avoided local individualisms. (The letters of St. Paul would not be an exception, though intended for single localities, for he would not be familiar with the peculiarities of Galatian or Achaian, still less of Roman *Κοινή*). To the question whether our authorities are right in speaking of a special Alexandrian Greek, Thumb practically returns a negative. For nearly all the purposes of our own special study, Hellenistic Greek may be regarded as a unity, varying almost only with the education of the writer, his tendency to use or ignore features of literary language, and his dependence upon sources in a foreign tongue which could be either freely or slavishly rendered into the current Greek.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

THE LETTERS TO THE SEVEN CHURCHES.

The Letter to the Church in Smyrna.

The letter to the Smyrnaeans forms in many ways a marked contrast to the Ephesian letter; it is constructed exactly on the same plan, but the topics are of a very different kind. Of all the seven letters this is expressed in the most continuous and unbroken tone of laudation. It is instinct with life and rejoicing; the joy is of the Christian type, caused not by ease and comfort and pleasures, but by the triumph over hardship and persecution, by superiority to circumstances; and the life is that strong vitality which overcomes death and rises victorious from apparent dissolution.

While the Ephesian letter appeals throughout to the past history of the Church in Ephesus, and attempts to rouse a fresh enthusiasm among the congregation by the memory of their previous glory as Christians, the Smyrnaean letter is to a remarkable degree penetrated with local feeling and urban patriotism.

The Smyrnaean Church is addressed by "the first and the last, which was dead and lived." All Smyrnaeans would appreciate the analogy to their own ancient history in those words. Strabo furnishes again the best commentary. He tells that the Lydians destroyed the ancient city of Smyrna, and for about 400 years there was no city, but

merely a state composed of villages scattered through the plain and over the hill-sides. Smyrna literally "was dead, and lived," like Him who addresses it.

The meaning of this opening address is obscured by the unfortunate mistranslation, which disfigures both the Authorized and the Revised Version, "which was dead[1] and lived *again*." The insertion of this word *again* is unjustified and unjustifiable: there is nothing in the Greek corresponding to it, and the quotations from Matthew ix. 18, John v. 25, Ezekiel xxxvii. 3,[2] do not constitute any sufficient defence. The analogy of Rev. xiii. 2 ff. corroborates the plain sense of this letter. The idea is, not that life begins a second time after a period of death, but that life persists through death. The Divine Sender of the letter to Smyrna "was dead and lived," and so likewise Smyrna itself "was dead and lived." A practical corroboration of these last words is found in an inscription belonging to the fourth century B.C.,[3] which mentions Smyrna as existing during the period when, as Strabo says, it was dead. If anything should be inserted in the translation to make the meaning quite clear, the word needed is *yet*, "which was dead and *yet* lived."

Smyrna during those four centuries ceased to exist as a Greek "city," but it lived as an Oriental village state, until it was refounded as a Greek city. Similarly Christ "became dead and *yet* lived."

After the introductory address, the letter begins with the usual statement. The writer has full knowledge of the past history of the Smyrnaean Church. Its history had been a course of suffering, and not (as the Ephesian history had been) of achievement. The Smyrnaean Church had had a more trying and difficult career than any other of

[1] Literally "became dead," or "became a corpse."
[2] They are given by Alford.
[3] It is published in *Mittheilungen des Instituts Athen*, vii. 179.

the Asian Churches. It had been exposed to constant persecution. It was poor in all that is ordinarily reckoned as wealth; but it was rich in the estimation of those who can judge of the realities of life. There is here the same contrast between appearance and reality as in the opening address: apparent poverty and real wealth, apparent death and real life.

The humble condition and the sufferings of the Smyrnaean Church are in this letter pointedly connected with the action of the Jews, and especially with the calumnies which they had circulated in the city and among the magistrates and the Roman officials. The precise facts cannot be discovered, but the general situation is unmistakable: the Smyrnaean Jews were for some reason more strongly and bitterly hostile to the Christians than the Jews of Asia generally. But the Asian Jews are little more than a name to us. Nothing is recorded about them except in their relations to the Christians. From general considerations we can form some opinion about their position in the cities, as stated in the EXPOSITOR, December 1901, January and February 1902; but in respect of details and facts we know nothing. Inscriptions mentioning Jews are rare and give little information.

Accordingly we cannot even speculate as to the reason for the exceptionally strong anti-Christian feeling among the Smyrnaean Jews. We must simply accept the fact; and we may, perhaps, conclude from it that the national feeling among them was unusually strong.

In an inscription of the second century[1] "the quondam Jews" are mentioned as contributing 10,000 (drachmae?) to some public purpose connected with the embellishment of the city. Böckh understood this enigmatic phrase to mean persons who had forsworn their faith and become

[1] CIG 3148, belonging to the latter part of the reign of Hadrian.

ordinary Smyrnaeans; but this is certainly wrong. Mommsen's view must, so far as we can judge, be accepted, that "the quondam Jews" were simply the body of the Jews of Smyrna, called "quondam" because they were no longer recognized as a separate nation by the Roman law (as they had been before A.D. 70). The reference proves that they maintained in practice so late as 130–137 their separate standing in the city as a distinct people, apart from the rest of the citizens, although legally they were no longer anything but one section of the general population, probably enrolled as a distinct tribe. A correction of a statement in the article on Smyrna in Dr. Hastings' *Dictionary*, iv. p. 555*a*, may here be added. It is there assumed as certain that all the Jews in Smyrna belonged to the class of resident strangers; but a more careful study of the position of Jews in the Asian cities [1] has shown that many Jews possessed the rights of citizenship in the Ionian cities, such as Smyrna. The quondam Jews who made that large contribution to embellish Smyrna were probably for the most part citizens.

We may also probably infer from the strong hatred felt by the Jews, that at first many of the Christians of Smyrna had been converted from Judaism. It was the Jewish Christians, and not the pagan converts, whom the national Jews hated so violently. Except in so far as the converts had been proselytes of the synagogue, the Jews were not likely to care very much whether Pagans were converted to Christianity: their violent hatred was roused by the renegade Jews like St. Paul, who tried to place the unclean Pagans on a level with themselves.

The action of the Jews in the martyrdom of Polycarp must be regarded (as a succession of writers have seen) as

[1] In the EXPOSITOR as quoted above, especially Jan. 1902, p. 22 f., and Feb. 1902, p. 92 f.

corroborating the evidence of this letter. In that case the eagerness of the Jews to expedite the execution of the Christian leader actually overpowered their objection to profane the Sabbath day, and they came into the gay assemblage in the Stadium, bringing faggots to make the fire in which Polycarp should be consumed. It must, however, be observed that they are not said to have been present at the sports in the Stadium. The games were over, as usual, at about 11 a.m. Thereafter the rather irregular trial of Polycarp was held; and about 2 p.m. the execution took place, and the most bitter opponents of the Christians had ample time to hear the news, assemble to hear the sentence, and to help in carrying it into effect. Undoubtedly, many who would abhor to appear as spectators of the games on a Sabbath would feel justified in putting to death an enemy of their faith on that day.

Severe trials still awaited the Church in Smyrna: "The devil is about to cast some of you into prison." . . . The expression must be understood as symbolical and figurative; and it would not be permissible to take "prison" in a sense too literal, as implying that imprisonment was the severest punishment that had as yet been, or was likely to be, inflicted on Christians, and that death was still unknown as a penalty for the crime of Christianity, and not even thought of as a possibility in the immediate future.

The "prison" into which the devil would cast some of the Smyrnaean Christians must be understood as a brief epitome of all the sufferings that lay before them; the first act, viz., their apprehension and imprisonment, is to be taken as implying all the usual course of trial and punishment through which passed the martyrs who are described in the later parts of the book. Prison was thought of by the writer of the letter as the prelude to execution, and was understood in that sense by his readers.

That this is so is proved by the promise that follows, "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life": Endure all that falls to the lot of the true and steadfast Christians, beginning with arrest and imprisonment, ending with execution: that death will not be the end, but only the entrance to the true life, the birthday of martyrdom. The martyr "was dead and lived"; he was not hurt of the second death.

The importance of this idea in the letter is proved by the conclusion, where it recurs in a slightly varied form: "he that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death." It is this triumph over death that constitutes the guiding thought of the whole letter, just as change was the guiding thought of the Ephesian letter. He that persists to the end, he that is steadfast and overcomes, shall triumph over death. Here, again, the final promise is seen to be peculiarly appropriate to the character and needs of the persons addressed.

Another expression which must be taken in a figurative or symbolic sense is, "thou shalt have tribulation ten days." The "ten days" means simply a period which can be measured, i.e. which comes to an end. The persecution will rage for a time, but it will not be permanent. The Church will live through it and survive it; and has therefore no reason to be afraid of it.

The expression "be faithful," again, would inevitably remind Smyrnaean readers of the history of their city, which had been the faithful friend and ally of Rome for centuries. It cannot be a mere accident that the only one of the Seven Churches with which the epithet πιστός is associated in the letters is the Church of that city which had established its historic claim to that epithet in three centuries of loyalty, the city which had been faithful to Rome in danger and difficulty, the city whose citizens had stripped off their own garments to send to the Roman soldiers when suffering from

cold and the hardships of a winter campaign. The honour in which Smyrna was always held by the Romans was proclaimed to be a return *pro singulari fide* (Livy xxxviii. 39); and its services were rewarded in A.D. 26 by the permission granted to it, in preference even to Ephesus, to dedicate the second Asian temple [1] to the reigning Emperor Tiberius and his family.

The same reflection occurs as in the case of Ephesus. Some may think that such an explanation of the reason why this special form of words in the exordium of this letter was chosen, and why the epithet "faithful" is applied to the Church, is fanciful and even unworthy. It is evident, however, that the study which is here presented has been made from a different point of view. It is not in accordance with right method to form *à priori* theories of what is right or wrong, dignified or undignified, possible or impossible, in the interpretation of St. John's words. The only true method is to take the words, and ask what they mean, and what must the readers, for whom they were in the first place written, have understood from them. Now considering how exactly those words, "was dead and lived," applied to ancient Smyrna, it seems certain that the reference must inevitably have been appreciated by the Smyrnaeans; and if so, it cannot have been an accidental coincidence. The writer deliberately chose those words to appeal to local sentiment and patriotism. The same remark applies to his choice of "faithful" as the appropriate epithet for the Smyrnaean Church. Not merely had the Church been faithful: the whole city regarded faithfulness as the chief glory of Smyrna; and the topic must have been familiar to all inhabitants and a commonplace in patriotic speeches.

[1] The first had been dedicated to Augustus by Pergamus; the third was erected in Ephesus at a later date.

It is evident that the writer of the Seven Letters did not discourage such feelings of attachment to their native city, but encouraged local patriotism and used it as a basis on which to build up a strenuous Christian life. He held that a Christian could be a patriot and ought to be proud of and interested in the glory and the history of his own city.

This gives a different impression of the writer's character from what might be gathered from later parts of the Apocalypse; but it is not good method to take parts of a book and determine the author's character from them alone. Rather, the Seven Letters are a truer index to the author's character than any other part of the Apocalypse, because in these letters he is in closer contact with reality than in any other part of the book.

Accordingly, we must accept the plain evidence of this letter, and infer (as in the Ephesian letter already) that to the writer of the letter the life of the Church in Smyrna was not disconnected from the life of the city; and this must be regarded as a general principle to be applied in other cases. The Church was to him the heart and soul of the city, and its members were the true citizens. Just as the so-called Jews in Smyrna were not the true Jews, but a mere synagogue of Satan, so the Pagans were not the true citizens, but mere servants of the devil. The true Jews and the true citizens were the Christians alone. To them belonged the heritage of the city's past history: its faithfulness, its persistence, its unconquerable and indestructible vitality, all were theirs. To them also belonged the whole ancient heritage of the Jews, the promises and the favour of God.

In the letter to Smyrna then we see an influence of which no trace was visible in the Ephesian letter. The stock topics of patriotic orators, the glories of the city, are plainly observable in the letter; and the writer had cer-

tainly at some time mixed in the city life, and become familiar with current talk and the commonplaces of Smyrnaean municipal patriotism.[1] In the Ephesian letter, on the other hand, it was the eternal features and the natural surroundings of the city that the writer referred to. The Smyrnaean letter is not without similar reference. The writer did not confine his attention to those ephemeral characteristics which have just been mentioned, or (to speak more accurately) he regarded those characteristics as merely the effect produced by eternal causes. He had thought himself into harmony with the natural influences which had made Smyrna what it was, and which would continue to mould its history; and from this lofty standpoint he could look forward into the future, and foretell what must happen to Smyrna and to the Church (which to him was the one reality in Smyrna). He foresaw permanence, stability, reality surpassing the outward appearance, life maintaining itself strong and unmoved amid trial and apparent death. In Ephesus he saw the one great characteristic, the changing, evanescent, uncertain relations of sea and land and river; and interpreted with prophetic instinct the inevitable future. In Smyrna he saw nothing of that kind. The city must live, and the Church must live in it. Sea and plain and hills were here unchanging in their combined effect, making the seat of a great city. It must endure much, but only for a definite, limited period; as a city it would suffer from invaders, who would surely try to capture it; and the Church not only would suffer along with the city, but would also suffer from the

[1] Patriotism still was almost entirely municipal, though the Roman Empire was gradually implanting in the minds of ordinary men a wider ideal of patriotism, extending to a nation and an empire, and not confined to a mere city. Greece had vainly tried to make the Hellenic idea strong in the common mind; philosophers had freed themselves from the narrowness of municipal patriotism; but it was left to Rome to make the wider idea effective among men.

busy trading city, in which the element hostile to God would always be strong.

And history has justified the prophetic vision of the writer. Smyrna, the recipient of the most laudatory of all the Seven Letters, is the greatest of all the cities. At the head of its gulf, which stretches far up into the land, it is the one important modern seaport of the whole country. It has tempted the cupidity of every invader, and has suffered from the greed and cruelty of many conquerors; but it has arisen, brilliant and strong, from every disaster. No Asian city gives the same impression of brightness and life, as one looks at it from the water, and sees it spread out on the gently sloping ground between the sea and the hill, and climbing up the sides of the graceful hill, crowned with the walls and towers of the mediaeval castle. That hill seems only a rounded hillock of 460 feet in elevation. But when you ascend it you find that it is not merely an isolated conical hill, as it seems from the sea to be. It is really only a corner of the great plateau that lies behind it. It is far stronger than at first you supposed, for it is supported from behind by the immeasurable strength of the continent, which pushes forward this hill, like a fist, towards the sea. Strength surpassing appearance, brightness, life: those are the characteristics of the letter and of the city.

In this letter no one can fail to recognize the tone of affection and entire approval. Whereas the writer urged the people of Ephesus to be as they once were, he counsels the Smyrnaeans to continue as they are now. Ephesus has to recover what it has lost, but Smyrna has lost nothing. The persecution and poverty which had been the lot of its Church from the beginning, and which would still continue for a period, kept it pure. There was nothing in it to tempt the unworthy or the half-hearted; whereas the dignity and high standing of the Ephesian Church had attracted some not entirely worthy members. The writer

looks confidently forward to the continuance of the same steadfastness in Smyrna. He does not even hint at the possibility of partial failure; he does not say, "If thou be faithful, I will give thee the crown"; he merely exhorts them to be faithful as they have been.

W. M. Ramsay.

PSALM LXIX.

Psalm lxix. is usually described as an imprecatory psalm. Most people know that it contains denunciations of enemies, and they are apparently content to know no more. The Psalmist is to them simply one who deals with *all words that may do hurt.* Yet while the Psalm consists of thirty-six verses, only seven of these are imprecatory, and the seven do not form the kernel of it. A broader description of the poem is necessary. If the reading of it which I am about to offer is correct, we may call it *a page from the inner history of a strong man at the crisis of one of his severest struggles.*

It is true that there are difficulties to be met. Psalm lxix. contains a great deal of language which is metaphorical,[1] so that it is hard to say precisely to what circumstances it refers, and yet the outline of a story may be traced with some confidence by the attentive reader.

We seem to see in this Psalm a leader of men in the midst of a great religious and patriotic task overcome for the moment by the contemplation of the failure of expected support on the one hand and of the rise of unexpected opposition on the other. He turns to his God, and the appeal almost of despair ends in the triumphant song of faith. It is, indeed, just such a psalm as Nehemiah might have written, if that strong man (like other strong men) had his times of depression.

Nehemiah was a member of the Persian Court and Cup-bearer to the King. For all we know to the contrary he and his fathers, back to the fifth or sixth generation, had never been in Palestine. He was in all probability the descendant of one who had been carried into captivity by Nebuchadrezzar some 150 years before. He had good reason to remain in Susa and enjoy the Persian king's favour,

[1] E.g. *v.* 21 is the metaphorical rendering of *v.* 20.

but he heard that his brethren in Judah were *in great affliction and reproach* (Neh. i. 3), and he was moved by religion and patriotism to take the far journey to Jerusalem to do what he could for his people.

His informant had not exaggerated the case. The walls of Jerusalem were full of breaches, the gates were destroyed, heaps of ruins obstructed the passage round the city. Nehemiah verified all this by his own observation, and then called the people together, told them that he came with the king's permission, and summoned them to action: *Come, and let us build up the wall of Jerusalem, that we be no more a reproach.*

At once opposition was aroused. The Ammonites, and Arabs, and Samaritans, neighbours who had encroached on the territory of Judah during the exile, did not wish to see the Jews once more united into a people with a walled city as their capital and rallying-place (Neh. ii. 19; iv. 1, 2). They assailed the builders with mockery and charged them with treason against the Persian government. Such words were certainly not without effect, for the Jews were few and weak, and the suggestion that the work was too great for them was too near the truth not to be dangerous. Some of the leaders stood aloof (Neh. iii. 5). But there was one heroic spirit which would not shrink. Nehemiah was in a new country, amid strange surroundings, far away from home and Court. But while his enemies threatened, he acted. Dividing the Jews into some forty working parties, he laboured to repair many of the breaches in the wall of Jerusalem at once. He sent his own servants to the work, and pressed on the building at every point. But while he laboured for the common good, he would not, though a king's deputy, exact from his fellow-countrymen any tax in money or kind for his own support. His table was well furnished and open, but the cost was his own (*ibid.* v. 14–18).

Work done in such a spirit told, but its very success raised fresh difficulties. When half the wall had been repaired, Samaritan and Arab and Ammonite were seized with jealous fury at the sight of that which had been achieved (*ibid.* iv. 7, 8). Vague threats were succeeded by plans of violence. The hearts of the Jews began to fail them, and they made the heaviness of the work an excuse for their fears: *The strength of the bearers of burdens is decayed, and there is much rubbish; so that we are not able to build the wall* (*ibid. v.* 10). For a moment it looked as if the mockery and threats of the Samaritans would prevail; it seemed as if the feeble strength of the reviving Jewish people would collapse at the sight of so much ill-will. Even a nation does not live by bread alone; the moral support and the moral hostility of its fellows touch its very life.

Nehemiah knew that the crisis had come, and he met it with prayer and with work. His prayer is recorded; it reminds us not a little of a well-known passage of the Psalm we are considering: *Hear us, O our God, for we are despised, and turn back their reproach upon their own head, . . . and cover not their iniquity, and let not their sin be blotted out from before Thee* (*ibid. vv.* 4, 5; compare Ps. lxix. 20, 27, 28).

Notice that these are not mere words of imprecation. They are the prayer of a worker who asks for two things: first, that his work may be saved from hindrance through the recoil of the efforts of the enemy upon themselves; and, secondly, that these efforts may not go unpunished by God. There is no idle cursing nor wanton malice here; in its essence it is a prayer for help in time of need.

But with Nehemiah work followed hard on prayer. He felt, in spite of all difficulties, that the present was an *acceptable time* (Ps. lxix. 13). God had not brought him to Jerusalem in safety from distant Susa for nothing. In the face of fresh difficulties he reorganized his forces

Instead of continuing to send all his servants to help in the work of building, he now kept back half of them fully armed to form the nucleus of a defending force (Neh. iv. 16). Then he placed arms in readiness for his builders [1] (*ibid. v.* 13), assigned to each of their chiefs his place, and set a watch. The courage of the people revived when they found that they had a real leader, so that Nehemiah could presently say, *We returned all of us to the wall, every man to his work.* The crisis for the nation at large was past. One resolute man had triumphed over the ill-will of the Samaritans, the fears of the Jews, and the disaffection of some Jewish nobles.

But the Samaritans now began to attack Nehemiah himself. They professed to believe that the building of the walls of Jerusalem would be misinterpreted at the Persian Court, and that the builder was exposing himself to the danger of a charge of treason. Accordingly they invited Nehemiah to meet them in conference outside the city (*ibid.* vi. 1–7). He answered in the memorable words: *I am doing a great work, so that I cannot come down.* Then they prompted some of their confederates in Jerusalem to tell the governor that he stood in danger of assassination, and to suggest to him that he should take refuge for a while in the temple. Again he answered in the simple words of true greatness: *Should such a man as I flee? and who is there who being such as I, would go into the temple to save his life? I will not go in* (*ibid.* vi. 11). This one man never flinched, and so in fifty-two crowded days of faith and fear, of prayer and work, the great task was finished, and Jerusalem stood up once more a walled city with gates and bars! Even the enemy *perceived* (as Nehemiah says) *that this work was wrought of our God* (*ibid. v.* 16).

Such is the outward history of an episode I dare to call great, though it belongs to a little people. Was its inner

[1] In addition to this each man carried some weapon (Neh. iv. 17, 18).

history ever written, in the Psalter, for instance, which is full of inner histories? And would not that inner history, if it could be discovered, tell of deeper fears and of a severer mental struggle in the hero of the story than the public record of the book of Nehemiah gives us? No positive answer can ever be given to these questions, but a comparison of Psalm lxix. with the account of Nehemiah's work suggests with very great force that this Psalm is the record of the Jewish governor's hopes and fears as he poured them out before God while the issue was yet undecided. Let us see how the leading passages answer to this suggestion.

The Psalmist begins his prayer in deep depression of spirit, and yet (as the closing verses show) his heart was stout enough at the core. Men as strong as Nehemiah have their times of doubt, almost of despair. The Psalmist complains that the ground has given way beneath his feet, the waters threaten to overwhelm him (*v.* 2). Such language is not at all unsuitable in the mouth of the man who had left the sunshine of a court to face and to share the lot of a small and oppressed people. But though he has made a great sacrifice, he is assailed with calumny in the new land, his motives are misrepresented, he is obliged to protest: *I paid them the things that I never took* (*v.* 4 P.-B. Vers.). Here surely speaks the king's deputy, who would not levy any tax for himself, and yet kept open table for his people (Neh. v. 14–18). Again, we see that the Psalmist feels, as Nehemiah felt, that all rested on his shoulders, the cause of the people of God was in his hand: *Let not those that wait on thee* (so he prays) *be ashamed through me, O Lord* (*v.* 6). Still more telling is the fact that the source of all the trouble is the same in both cases. The Psalmist's cry, *The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up, and the reproaches of them that reproached thee are fallen upon me* (*v.* 9), is the very motto of Nehemiah's

career, for zeal on behalf of Jerusalem was in its essence zeal for the house of God. The holy city and the Holy House were one.[1]

The parallels do not cease here; they are to be found throughout the Psalm. When the Psalmist complains that the elders *who sit in the gate speak against him* (*v.* 12), we are reminded of the fact that Nehemiah's adversaries were drawn in part from the leaders of his own people. We pass on to the next verse, and at once we meet a phrase which breathes the very spirit, the indomitable spirit, of the king's cupbearer from Susa: *My prayer is unto thee, O Lord, in an acceptable time.* How was the time *acceptable?* Everything seemed to be against the Psalmist! Yes, but to the penetrating glance of faith the *acceptable time* is not the smooth time (which either does not come at all or else does not stay!), but the time at which fresh effort can avail to turn the doubtful event to victory. To Nehemiah, conscious of a Divine guidance watching over him from the court of Susa to the ruined walls of Jerusalem, the crisis at which the enemy put forth his fullest resistance was God's *acceptable time*—was indeed the hour of victory for those who were not afraid to work for God.

Lastly, it may be said that the hopes of the writer of the Psalm were precisely those of Nehemiah: *God will save Zion, and will build the cities of Judah* (*v.* 35).

Turning back now to the Psalmist's imprecations against the enemy, we see them in their true context and in their due proportion. We compare them with Nehemiah's own prayer against the Samaritans and their allies recorded in the book of Nehemiah (iv. 4, 5). The foes are not private ones, but public; the imprecations are not the expression of an idle hatred, but a prayer that a dangerous national enemy may be punished and reduced to impotency.

Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written

[1] The *Holy House* is an Arabic name for Jerusalem.

for our learning (Rom. xv. 4)—St. Paul did *not* say, *For our imitation.* Psalm lxix. is not a model prayer for Christian men, but Christian men may learn a good deal from it, if they will. Let those who feel how deeply portions of this Psalm fall below the level of Christian Charity and Christian Placability see to it that on a like occasion they do not themselves fall, either in word or thought or deed, equally far below it! And while they blame the old Hebrew's bitterness, let them recognize and imitate his resolution and his faith. The Psalm writer, be he Nehemiah or another, is a light, a broken light of God, and those who have seen it are responsible to the Source of all light to act in accordance with the vision which has been shown them.

W. Emery Barnes.

ST. PAUL THE POET.

ALL men, and in a special degree great men, are many-sided, and it is often the purest accident that decides which of their various aspects shall appear the most important in the eyes of the world. We know Hannibal mainly as a general; but, for all we can guess, he may have been still greater as a linguist or as an epigrammatist than as a winner of victories. Did we know more about Shakspere, he might, like Dr. Johnson, owe his fame rather to his conversation than to his writings. No man is ever really known or fairly appreciated by a single one of his fellow-beings; his various aspects strike various men differently, and the concurrent judgment of the world, itself but a rough and ready appraisement, is necessary to decide his proper place; for, even when impartially viewed by an individual critic, he tends to be ranked by him, not according to the sum of his powers, but according to the critic's view of one particular fraction of his total equipment.

Of all men that ever lived, St. Paul was perhaps the most bewilderingly manifold. It is possible to imagine an athlete admiring him for his prodigious feats of physical endurance; it is not everybody who could have endured a night and a day in the deep, and soon after recovered sufficiently to stand forty stripes save one from his fellow-countrymen or still more severe scourgings from Roman lictors. In mere bodily elasticity, in spite of his weak "presence," he must have been an extraordinary man—his journeys, his days of preaching followed by evenings of tent-making are enough to show it—yet few people think first of Paul as a sort of Weston or Shorland. His speech may have been contemptible to the Corinthians; yet it moved the *blasés* Athenians to renounce their pursuit of something new and to desire to hear him again. Yet he was far more

than an orator. As a leader of men he rivalled Napoleon; as an organizer the very constitution of the Christian Church to-day is a testimony to his powers. Of his depth and force as a thinker, what need is there to speak? "The Epistle to the Romans," said Coleridge, no mean judge of profundity, "is the most profound work in the world"; yet this same Coleridge was equally struck by the fact that to all this Paul added the courteous grace and refinement of a Lancelot. Of the Knights of the Table Round who founded the great order of Christian chivalry, Paul was "the most nobly mannered man of all." As a perfect specimen of the *genus homo*, "totus, teres, atque rotundus," in fact, if we put aside all moral and religious considerations, we shall find perhaps only the great Julius worthy to be put into comparison with Paul.

But there was yet another aspect of this myriad-minded man to which too little attention has been directed; and the ignoring of which has, we believe, issued in a fundamental misconception of his writings. Before and beyond everything else we regard Paul as a poet. His eloquence, his theology, his general view of the world, were all coloured by his poetical nature—nay, they were all *made* by it. His speeches, so far as they have descended to us, are poetical in their very texture; his theology, as we hope to show, is that of a man who is poet first and theologian afterwards; and his very conception of the possibility of a gospel for the Gentiles proves a width and power of imagination which, among Jews, is paralleled in Isaiah, and in Isaiah alone. The other Apostles were Jews, and narrow: Paul, though a Hebrew of the Hebrews, was a poet, and therefore the broadest of men. He had all the sublime daring of his compatriot Heine, together with a reverence the very conception of which was lacking to Heine. In a word, he who alone of the Jews looked forward to the time when there should be neither Jew nor Greek, was himself

that most amazing of combinations, Jew and Greek in one.

The comparison between Paul and Shakspere may at first sight seem a bold one indeed. Yet it descends to minute particulars. Like Shakspere, Paul did not disdain a play upon words. In *Richard the Second*, the sick Gaunt plays nicely with his name; in the Epistle to Philemon, Paul the aged plays upon the name Onesimus. The style of Paul, like that of Shakspere, is a style in which the sense constantly breaks the bonds of the language, and in which strict grammar is always subordinated to vigour. The speeches of Prospero, with their anacoluthons, their daring distortions, their strength of meaning combined with laxity of syntax, are marvellously similar to the Epistles of Paul. That method of "linked suggestion," again, on which Shakspere's sentences are constructed, is pre-eminently characteristic of Paul, and in Paul, as in Shakspere, the latter end of a sentence, like that of Gonzalo's commonwealth, frequently forgets its beginning. In both, there is a sublime indifference to mere logical correctness, and in both the supreme aim of style is attained, the expression of thoughts that breathe so that they seem actually to burn into the brain of the reader. Allowing for a few differences, the remarks of Abbott on the general character of Shaksperian grammar apply almost without alteration to the Pauline. Nor is it hard to believe that in substance also, the two might have been found similar; that the Paul who wrote so discriminatingly to Timothy and to Titus had a conception of the niceties of human nature not much inferior to Shakspere's; and that he who wrote the first chapter of Romans was not incapable of creating a Regan, a Goneril, or an Edmund.

Not every lover of poetry is a poet: a sad experience has shown us all that the capacity for appreciating the verse of others is no guarantee that one's own has the true ring; yet it is instructive to observe that Paul, of all the writers in

the New Testament, is the one whose quotations are almost invariably from the poets. He has indeed a Tennysonian faculty for using the ideas of his predecessors. If he wishes to inculcate the necessity of choosing good companions, he quotes Menander; if to assert the fatherhood of God, he quotes Aratus; if to summarize in an epigram the Cretan character, he quotes Epimenides. Still more significant are his allusions to Old Testament writers. Of the seventy-eight references to these authors in the Epistle to the Romans, forty-one are from Isaiah or the Psalms; and even when dealing with the comparatively prosaic subject-matter of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, he draws his illustrations in astonishingly large quantity from the poetical books. While Peter—to choose but one example—seems to have preferred to garnish his writings by allusions to history or selections from proverbs, Paul's mind, saturated with poetry, has recourse instinctively to the poets of the two nations from whose midst he sprang. Among the books, and especially the parchments, the want of which he felt in his imprisonment, may not some have been the works of Cleanthes or Menander?

Similarly, when he has recourse to history, he views it not like an antiquary but like a poet. The account of Hagar is to him an allegory, rich in lessons only to be deduced by a poetic imagination. The story of the birth of Jacob and Esau is indeed to him a fact, but a fact transfigured with an imaginative meaning. He seems to have cared little for facts as such. Even as to the incidents of Christ's life he confers not with flesh and blood, but retires to Arabia to meditate upon them; much as Shakspere troubled little about the historic accuracy of the details of Holinshed, but was deeply interested in their poetical and spiritual truth.

But Paul is not only a lover of poetry; nor does he merely detect a poetical inwardness in historic incident;

he is constantly falling into poetical phraseology and imagery. The doxologies, and fragments of Church hymns, with which his Epistles are studded, may or may not be his own; though we incline to the view that, like Wesley, he contributed to the hymnology of his own services; but we are not left to conjectures like these for indications of his "insuppressive poetic mettle." In the Epistle to the Romans, after a lengthened and profound disquisition on the nature of faith, and the doctrine of justification, he begins to exhort his readers: "I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, *that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice.*" What a daring flight of poetry is this! It is a metaphor so deep that scores of sermons have not exhausted its meaning, and only our unfortunate familiarity with it prevents us from realizing how far removed from prose it is. It is followed by a series of practical maxims, in which we detect now the style of Theognis, and now that of the Proverbs of Solomon. In the Epistle to the Ephesians, again, having occasion to urge watchfulness and courage upon his readers, he gives them a number of metaphors of which the extreme boldness and beauty have long been lost through use, but which must have roused the minds of his Ephesian readers, to whom they came fresh, like the strokes of a whip. "Put on," he says, in words for which his favourite Isaiah had given but the barest hint, "the whole armour of God. Stand, having girded your loins with truth, and having put on the breastplate of righteousness, and having shod your feet with the preparation of the Gospel of peace; withal taking the shield of faith; and take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God." If this is not poetry, then Spenser's *Faerie Queene* itself, that most poetical of poems, must be adjudged to be prose: for what is the *Faerie Queene* but an expansion of these few verses?

Once more, in the eighth chapter of Romans, after an

extremely original and imaginative comparison of a man possessed with sin to a body that is dead, Paul rises to a height of exaltation for which only the hyperbolical style of his Hebrew models can find a fitting expression—and the style must have struck strangely upon those used to the placidity of ordinary Greek—"For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God." Had similar words, describing earthly affection, occurred in *Romeo and Juliet*, their poetical and intangible character would have been manifest, and much evil would have been saved; but, occurring in a theological treatise, they have been subjected to the analysis of dry-as-dust exegetes until all the glow and passion have been annotated out of them. Yet, after all, the *Paradiso* of Dante is a theological treatise also.

It is needless, surely, to accumulate other illustrations of a fact which would have been patent to all but for the extreme familiarity of the language. Just as it is hard to see the merits of "To be or not to be" simply because its merits are so great that they have become hackneyed and all but obsolete, so it has been with Paul. Yet, once noticed, this feature in him strikes us everywhere. He was such a poet that even in his most philosophical dissertations, even in his personal apologies, even in his private letters—nay, in such a *Cura Pastoralis* as the Epistle to Titus—he often forgets himself and bursts into lyrical utterance. What a calamity has it been that this most passionate and poetical of men should have been treated like a compiler of a theological compendium! No man that ever lived could bear logical dissection worse; few men repay more the sort of study which Coleridge or Dowden has given to Shakspere. Like the faults of Cassius, his most ethereal and visionary imaginations have been observed, set in a note-book, conned and learned by

rote: one passage has been compared with another; his ironies have been taken in earnest, his hyperboles gravely scrutinized, his metaphors treated as literal. Yet, such chapters as the thirteenth and fifteenth of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, starting up in the midst of one of his prosiest works, should have taught these commentators better things.

Of all Paul's poems none is more intensely lyrical than the Epistle to the Colossians: and few, as we might have expected, have been subjected to more unmerciful dissection. It is full, almost throughout, of a Shelleyan, impalpable, ethereal imagination, whose meaning is only to be grasped by those who approach it *as* poesy. The painful grammarian, the textual critic, the strict and logical theologian, have no place here. This is not the ground on which an *οὖν* may be properly based, or a Socinian routed. As well try to draw out the meaning of *Epipsychidion* in ninety-five philosophical theses as try to extort the thirty-nine articles from these "noble numbers." Hardly a word will bear the scrutiny of the learned Thebans of exegesis; but he who has the true music in his soul, and is moved by the concord of these sounds, will find here a divine lyric, "a wonder and a wild desire," surpassing the utterances of all other mystic bards. Not staying to calculate or refine, heedless whether he may be found guilty of self-contradiction or not, Paul here yields himself to a rushing tide of enthusiasm that bears him into regions of which it is hardly lawful for man to speak. Whether he is in the body or out of the body he knows not; suffice it that he is under the inspiration of the Spirit of God. His words, indeed, do not fall into metrical lengths; his lines do not always begin with capital letters; but their imagery, their passion, their fine frenzy, glancing from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven, seem literally to body forth the forms of things unknown, and to give a local habitation and a

name to the most airy and impalpable of spiritual things. The poetic strain begins early. "The hope" of the Colossians is "laid up for them in the heavens." Not only is the phrase absolutely original—parallels to it having been sought in vain—but the metaphor of hope as a treasure laid up for future use is one that could only have occurred to a poet. Similarly, in the hurried and broken sentence that follows, in which the most determined grammarian seeks in vain for some analytical correctness, we stumble upon the illuminating word "bearing fruit" applied to the Gospel. Here, it it is true, there is nothing original; it is the simplest of applications of the Parable of the Sower; but it reminds us once again of Paul's habitually imaginative and metaphorical way of writing, due to a poetic soul. A verse or two further on, and we find "Who rescued us from the tyranny of darkness, and removed us into the kingdom of the son of his love." Who else than a poet would have seen the likeness between the deliverance from sin and one of those colossal transportations of whole peoples from one region to another?

Such highly metaphorical language having already been used, we are prepared for some still more daring figures of speech. Christ is "the image of the invisible God." No one but a commentator would desire to deprive this glorious figure of all its splendour by a pedantic definition of its meaning. Paul is on fire; we too have caught something of his glow; and then a Lightfoot comes along, and, in a page of closely printed notes, informs us that the word "image" involves the ideas of likeness, representation, and manifestation. It may, or it may not, involve all these meanings or more; but we may be quite sure that Paul, in the full flow of his inspiration, dictating at top speed to the panting Tertius, wasted but little thought on the connotations or denotations of his words. The man who could find no time, so often, for even a verb, and left his reader to

supply it as best he could, was not the man to pause and think of all the associations of every metaphor or abstract term he chanced to use. Whether or not the word "image," like the word "first-begotten" immediately following, had a special meaning to the school of Philo, matters little to the argument. There are special philosophical terms in "In Memoriam"; but Tennyson refused to be bound down to any one metaphysical creed.

When once this simple fact is realized, how vain do all the discussions on single Pauline words appear! Yet this very passage has been the battle-ground of sects innumerable: Calvinism, Antinomianism, Trinitarianism, Sabellianism, and almost every other *ism* that ever was. Paul is not here writing as a theologian, but as a bard; and his "thrones, lordships, governments, authorities," are no more to be taken as an exhaustive summary of all possible grades of celestial precedence than Homer's "δαέρων, ἤ γαλόων, ἠ εἰνατέρων εὐπέπλων," is to be taken as a complete list of legal relationships. Those who imagine that here we have a tabulated and reasoned theology had better first show how it was that a man so precise and exact as to omit not a rank among the angels could have combined a ὑμᾶς at the beginning of verse 21 with ἀποκατηλλάγητε at the end. Half-a-dozen anacoluthons in a few lines are not, even in Greek, the mark of accurate and logical thinking. We may, if we like, apply the methods of verbal annotation to so careful and measured a production as the Epistle to the Hebrews: what is wanted in dealing with Paul is not minute criticism, but width of view, general sympathy, and a comprehension of what is meant by the white heat of inspiration.

An instructive parallel may be drawn between Sir Walter Scott and St. Paul. Sir Walter, his mind overflowing with fact, anecdote, patriotic feeling, sat down to his Waverley novels, and all the riches of his enormous store-

house came pouring forth upon the page. In St. Paul, an overflowing love of Christ, an overwhelming sense of Christ's greatness, an abounding zeal to spread His kingdom, informed every action of his life and dictated every word he wrote. But, just as a minute dissection is the last thing required for the due appreciation of Scott, so, to appreciate Paul, we need no microscopic scrutiny, no nice weighing of words, no gerund-grinding. It is with him as with the rainbow; we must stand off to see his splendour; a too close inspection dissolves the radiance into mist.

Let no one say that a commentary written on these lines would be loose and inexact, or deficient in scholarship. The precise reverse is the case. Such a commentary would demand in the first place a literary sense only to be acquired by wide and deep study of the great masterpieces of the world. The commentator must have steeped himself in poets like Milton, Dante, and Shakspere, until he has gained a sympathy with poetic minds and a power of following their celestial movements. Secondly, he needs to study the special idiosyncrasies of Paul's intellect, his early training, his root ideas, his practical statesmanship. Thirdly, and most important of all, the commentator must possess himself less a theological than a religious mind. He must understand what conversion is, and have something of the burning enthusiasm for Christ and humanity which Paul possessed. To him, as to Paul, to live must be Christ. Such a combination as this is not an easy thing to find or to make; and it is probable enough that many generations shall have passed before the world sees it.

E. E. KELLETT.

THE KORAN AND THE "BOOKS OF MOSES."

THE EXPOSITOR for February, 1886, contains an article from the pen of Professor Curtiss entitled "Professor Julius Wellhausen and his Theory of the Pentateuch," which was doubtless the means of introducing many English-speaking students to the now generally accepted view of the origin of those books of the Old Testament which formerly went by the name of "the books of Moses."

The whole problem remains practically where Wellhausen left it in 1878, after which his statement of it was accepted by German professors on all sides, although Professor Curtiss declares that he "does not know of more than one who publicly acknowledged that his critical views were changed through Wellhausen's History of Israel. This was done by Kautzsch." No doubt later writers have sought to emulate Wellhausen by working along one or other of the lines he laid down, but it has only been the endeavour of the disciple to outbid the master, and the results have in no instance been generally accepted. What is known as the Higher Criticism does not cease to be linked to the name of Wellhausen, as the credit of introducing the penny postage will always belong to Rowland Hill.

Summing up Wellhausen's account of the true course of Israelitish history, based upon his analysis of the Pentateuch, Professor Curtiss says: "Now if we regard the Jehovistic, Deuteronomic, Ezekelian, and Priest's Code as forming a pyramid with the Jehovistic work as the base and the Priest's Code as the apex, we shall find that there are steps on each of the four sides ascending to the top, and that the apex is four-faced: 1. On the side of the sacred seasons, ascending to the year of jubilee; 2. On that of sacred places, reaching the one legitimate place of worship in the temple at Jerusalem; 3. Sacred ceremonies, which

find their culmination in the sacrifices of the great day of atonement; 4. Sacred persons, attaining their highest dignity in the high priest, who is at the same time an ecclesiastical and civil ruler.

The sacred seasons are the Sabbath, the sabbatical year, and the year of jubilee: also the three annual feasts which, from being purely agricultural, passed into solemn religious functions. As to the place of sacrifice there is at first no restriction: later one spot is singled out, which finally becomes the one recognized sanctuary. Sacrifice, again, is at first merely the slaughtering of a beast, the flesh of which the owner eats in common with his friends and his God. Lastly, the grades of sacred persons are "young men, Levites, sons of Zadok, sons of Aaron, and a complete hierarchy with the high priest at its head."

It will be seen that this pyramidal arrangement of the religious development of Israel is, taken as a whole, simply the old traditional account standing on its head; and the question is merely whether the pyramid *should* stand upon its base, or upon its apex; or, rather, whether the history is better represented by a pyramid diminishing from its base, or by a tree springing from small beginnings and spreading its branches wider as it grows.

In attempting to arrive at some satisfactory decision upon this point it is not necessary to rely upon pure theory, as is usually done. All theorizing about the history of Israel which is based solely upon the history of Israel is obviously futile. It is admitted that the critical argument is mere reasoning in a circle. To base a theory upon certain documents and then to alter and manipulate the documents in order to demonstrate the theory based upon them is clearly absurd. The consequence is that no argument is possible in the matter, because there are no premises from which to start. Instead of that, two independent accounts of the early history of Israel are presented to the observer, the

traditional account and the account given by the critics, and he is asked to decide, by a sort of instinct, which account is correct: and the general opinion pronounces the narrative of the critics to be the more rational and to agree better with human experience.

The educated man in the street, however, is not altogether in the best position to pronounce upon the question in hand. As a rule he has had a purely classical training and is familiar with the literatures of Greece and Rome and of the modern West, and to him the Old Testament is something unique, something unparalleled in his experience, and he is compelled either to regard it as lying quite outside the laws of nature which regulate all other mundane affairs, or else to break it up and "reconstruct" it in conformity with them.

Fortunately, we are not compelled to have recourse to either of these alternatives. It is only necessary to extend one's horizon so as to embrace the nearer East, in order to find that the traditional history of Israel is neither unique nor unparalleled. Wellhausen himself has indicated where the light which will illuminate the Hebrew annals is to be sought for, in betaking himself to the study of the Arabs and of the rise of Islam. "I have gone over," he says, "from the study of the Old Testament to that of the Arabs, with the purpose of getting to know that wild stock upon which priests and prophets grafted the shoot of the Torah of Yahveh. For I am convinced that a proper conception of the equipment with which the Hebrews made their appearance in history is best obtained by means of a comparison with the early history of the Arabs."[1] If, indeed, we would obtain a proper idea of the forces which produced the Israelite nation and religion, we shall not do so by any analysis of documents in the light of the history of the

[1] *Muhammad in Medina*, cited in the EXPOSITOR, in the article referred to.

classical and modern West, but by a comparison with the course of history in Arabia and other Semitic lands. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that a nursery edition of the *Arabian Nights* throws more light upon the Old Testament life and literature than the most learned and painstaking German commentary.

There are three momentous events in the history of South-western Asia, each of which so closely resembles the others, that the three may be regarded as a repetition of the same phenomenon. This phenomenon was the appearance of a new religion in the world, and the occurrences of it with which we are most familiar, and which have left permanent results, are the rise of the Israelite, Christian and Muhammadan systems. It is, indeed, only with the last of these that we are well-nigh as familiar as we could wish to be, but of the second also we know enough to be sure that all three, externally at least, followed very much the same lines. When we find the same phenomenon recurring three times, and on two of these occasions from the same cause, we are bound to infer that the result in the third instance also was due to the same cause as in the other two. In the present case the Muhammadan system offers the best subject for examination, as the text of the Korán and the facts of Muhammad's life are too well substantiated to allow of the principles and methods of higher criticism being applied to them, although, but for that, the Korán rather lends itself to critical analysis, even better than the Old Testament books.

If anyone were to have a view of the Israelite, Christian and Muhammadan systems presented to him for the first time, what would strike him most about them would probably not be anything in the systems themselves so much as the personality of their founders. He would not look for the kernel of the religion at the close of its development, but at the beginning. This is just where modern criticism

seems to go off the rails. Men who have been trained to think scientifically and whose minds are imbued with the idea of development and evolution, naturally think of religion and the other arts as coming under the same laws as the physical sciences, and as growing like them from lower to higher. An Oriental, on the other hand, would no more think of applying the scientific method to the history of religions than an art critic would dream of finding the highest art in present-day Europe or America, instead of in the Italy of the Renaissance or the Greece of Pericles.

The most striking feature in the three systems mentioned above is the suddenness with which they burst upon the world. No doubt the rapidity and extent of the spread of the faith were much greater in the case of Muhammadanism than in that of Christianity, as they were much greater in the case of Christianity than in that of the religion of Israel; but that was mostly due to external circumstances of place and time. The point to be noted is that these were not organisms which grew up by slow and painful degrees from a feeble germ, absorbing nourishment from and at the expense of their environment. The only process in nature to which they can adequately be compared is the sudden eruption of a volcano.

Where there is smoke there is fire. Arguing by analogy, from what we know of Christianity and Muhammadanism, we may be sure that the sudden appearance of Israel upon the world's stage was the work of one man not less great than Moses is represented to have been. The tendency of modern writers is to belittle the part played by Moses. Indeed, in the "reconstructed" history he is by no means an essential figure, and would have been dropped altogether, if that had been possible. According to the Biblical account, on the other hand, Moses is the mainspring of the whole movement, which but for him would never have occurred, and it is no more possible to imagine

Israel without Moses than to think of Islám apart from the Arabian prophet.

In order, however, to bring about amongst Semites the birth of a new faith there is required something more than a mighty personality. A second element, which is always present, is a Written Revelation. Muhammad himself perceived this. It is, indeed, the revelation which makes the prophet. It is not possible for an educated European, to whom books are like the dust on the streets, to know what writing means to an unlettered people. Embodied in charms it possesses powers of life and death, and in any form is regarded as a species of magic. Eloquence too casts the same spell upon the Oriental mind. Muhammad declared it to be a form of enchantment. The Arab sheikh is not only the bravest man of his tribe, but the best poet as well. Alike in the séances of the Hebrew seers and in the assemblies of the early Christians, the manner of the utterance was everything. When the eloquent speech was clothed in written form, it acted with permanent force.

This is best seen in the sway which the Korán has held over Muhammadans down to the present day. Even before it was written down Muhammad's worst enemy could not deny its charm. Ibn Ishák gives an amusing account of a meeting of Muhammad's fellow-tribesmen, the Koraish, under the presidency of Waleed, the son of Al Mugheerah, which was held for the purpose of defining Muhammad's position, in case strangers coming to the fair should ask about him. Waleed opened the meeting by calling upon the Koraish to agree upon some one opinion which they should all hold concerning Muhammad.

"Do thou, O Waleed," they replied, "make the opinion for us, and we will speak by it."

"Nay," answered Waleed, "say ye, and I will listen!"

Some one suggested, "Let us say that Muhammad is a soothsayer!"

"Nay, by Allah," replied Waleed, "he is no soothsayer. I have seen soothsayers, and he hath not the soothsayer's mumbling and rhyming."

"Then let us call him a poet," said the tribesmen.

"He is not a poet," answered Waleed; "I know poetry of all sorts, with its iambics and antispastics and long syllables reckoned as short and all that; and this is not poetry."

"Let us say he is a charmer," was the next suggestion.

"He is not a charmer," returned Waleed. "I have seen charmers and their charming, and this is no blowing and tying of knots."

"What *shall* we say then, O Waleed?" the tribesmen asked in despair.

Waleed replied: "Verily, by Allah, his words are sweet. Their stem is a palm-tree, and their branches are a garden; and there is naught ye can say of all this, but it will be known to be false, and perhaps the truest thing ye can say about him is that ye say he is a charmer, and his words are a charm; and they divide between a man and his father, and between a man and his brother, and between a man and his wife, and between a man and his tribe."

Therewith the meeting broke up.

Muhammad was well aware that his words acted upon the Arabs like sorcery. He appealed to the diction of the Korán as a standing miracle, and defied his opponents to produce anything like it. Professor Nöldeke interprets this challenge to mean that the Korán, being a denunciation of polytheism, Muhammad's opponents, who were polytheists, could naturally not compose anything in the same strain. This, of course, is the matter-of-fact Teutonic love of accounting for all phenomena upon every-day European lines. What Muhammad evidently meant his challenge to refer to was the poetry of the Korán, for

which he alone possessed the inspiration. That his claim was just is clear not merely from the ease and swiftness with which his followers, fired by his words, overran half the known world in the first century of Islám, but by the fatal courage with which half-naked Muslims still encounter wounds and death "in the way of God."

The charm which the voice and presence of Jesus exercised over His contemporaries, and which the mere diction of the Gospel still exerts over the minds of men, must have been very like that with which Muhammad bewitched the Arabs of his day, and the results which it produced were the same.

In the case of Israel the facts also are the same, but on a smaller scale. A few weak and scattered nomad tribes suddenly combined and seized the territory of the rich and powerful Canaanites, and from that day they have not ceased to exist as one of the nations of the world, even after being deprived of their land, their one bond of union being the Law alone. Behind this movement there must have stood, if the analogy of history be worth anything, a Man and a Book. Every other similar occurrence known to us has been a return to what Muhammad well called "the religion of Abraham," that is, to pure monotheism. We may be certain too that Moses' message was delivered in highly poetic form, and equally certain that it was not so completely lost as is generally supposed. It is just as easy to imagine Islám without the Korán, or Christianity without the Gospels, as to suppose that the impetus given by Moses to his nation continued to be felt without either living voice or written word. There are many passages in the first five books of the Old Testament, especially in the Book of Deuteronomy, which may well have inspired the Israelites with faith and courage enough to seize that earthly inheritance which was to be their reward for fighting the battles of the Lord.

There are many minor respects in which the native account of the origin of the Israelite nation and faith finds an exact parallel in the early history of Islám. It may be sufficient to refer to three.

More than a decade after the death of Muhammad all the tribes of Arabia, which he and his successor had welded together, remained still a united whole. Under the wise policy of Aboo Bekr, assisted by the sword of Khalid, the son of Waleed, the Arab state was consolidated, and by the end of the caliphate of Omar the subjugation of Persia, Syria and Egypt had been completed. It was not until after the assassination of Omar that leaders arose in different localities whose success naturally led to the hegemony of their own tribes. In regard to the history of Israel the modern theory tends to reject the narrative of the conquest of Canaan by the people as a whole, given in the Book of Joshua, in favour of a conquest by individual tribes, apparently suggested by the Book of Judges ; but a comparison with Arab history shows that the two factors are complementary.

As the Arabs carried their arms beyond the confines of Arabia it became increasingly evident that they could not hold the conquered territories in person. The land was therefore left in the hands of its original owners, the proceeds being paid over to the State, which in turn paid fixed pensions to the individual conquerors. This involved the registration of the whole people. A similar registration of the Israelite tribes upon their occupation of Canaan can hardly have been avoided, and some of the lists in the Old Testament may have originated upon this occasion. Here, of course, Christianity does not present a parallel on account of the early communism, any more than in the previous case, on account of its rejection of the use of force.

The only nobility which Islám recognizes is descent

from Alee and Fatimah, the daughter of the Prophet. In Persia the form of Alee looms larger than that of Muhammad. These two figures, Muhammad and Alee, stand side by side in Islám very much as Moses and Aaron do in the history of Israel. Moses and Muhammad are the lawgivers and spiritual heads, but the nobility which comes by birth is derived from Aaron and Alee. The descendants of Alee are at the present day counted by tens of thousands, and in the last resort the authority of the Sultan is second to that of the Shareef.

The purport of the preceding pages has been to show that whatever objections may be brought against the traditional history of the early beginnings of Israel, that history follows from point to point the course afterwards cut out for itself by Islám.

T. H. Weir.

CHARACTERISTICS OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

IV.

BEFORE we begin to examine the conditions of Hellenistic syntax, which must obviously hold the first place for the student of New Testament exegesis, it will be well to spend some time upon the forms, which give us the surest evidence as to the position occupied by the sacred writers between the literary and the illiterate Greek of their time. The question naturally arises, how far we can be sure that we possess the exact forms that were used by the writers themselves. May not our best MSS. have conformed the orthography to the popular style, just as those of the "Syrian" text conformed it in some respects to the literary standards? We cannot give a universal answer to the question, for, as we have seen already, the rise of an artificial orthography undoubtedly left the door open for not a few uncertainties. But there are some suggestive signs that the great uncials, in this respect as in others, are not far away from the autographs. A very instructive phenomenon is the curious substitution of ἐάν for ἄν after ὅς, ὅπου, etc., which W.H. have faithfully reproduced in numberless places from the MSS. This was so little recognized as a genuine feature of vernacular Greek that the editors of the volumes of papyri began by gravely subscribing "l. ἄν" wherever this abnormal form showed itself. They were soon compelled to save themselves the trouble. Deissmann (p. 204) gave a considerable list from the papyri, which abundantly proved the genuineness of this ἐάν; and four years later (1901) the material had grown so much that it was possible to determine the time-limits of the peculiarity with fair certainty. If my count is right,[1] the

[1] *Class. Rev.* xv. 32. I have not brought the count up to date in the two subsequent articles (xv. 434, xviii. 106), but the results would not be weakened if this were done.

proportion of ἐάν to ἄν is 1 : 2 in papyri dated B.C. But the estimate was based on only 12 occurrences. The proportion was soon reversed, being 25 : 7 in the first century A.D., 76 : 9 in the second, 9 : 3 in the third, 4 : 8 in the fourth. ἐάν occurs last in a sixth century papyrus. It will be seen that the construction itself was specially common in the first two centuries A.D., when ἐάν greatly predominated, and that the fashion had almost died away before the great uncials were written. It seems to follow that in this small point the uncials faithfully reproduce originals written under conditions which had passed away in their time.[1] This particular example affords us a very good test, but we may reinforce it with a variety of cases where the MSS. accurately reproduce the spelling of the first century. I will follow the order of the material in W.H. *App.* 141 ff. ("Notes on Orthography"): it will not be necessary to give detailed references for the papyrus evidence, which will be found fully stated in the three *Classical Review* papers already cited. We must bear in mind from the first Hort's caution (p. 141) that "all our MSS. have to a greater or less extent suffered from the effacement of unclassical forms of words," and his statement that the Western MSS. show the reverse tendency. "The orthography of common life, which to a certain extent was used

[1] The case of ἄν, *if*, is separate. In the New Testament it is confined apparently to the Fourth Gospel, where it occurs six times. In the papyri it is decidedly a symptom of illiteracy. With this agrees what Meisterhans[3] 255 f. says: "Only six times is ἄν found from the 5th to the 3rd cent. B.C. The form ἄν is entirely foreign to the Attic inscriptions, though it is often found in the Ionicising literary prose of the 5th cent. (Thucydides, cf. the tragedians)." Since ἄν is the modern form, we may perhaps regard it as a dialect variant which ultimately ousted the Attic ἐάν, but it is hard to say why the Gospel has it and why the Apocalypse has not. There is some difficulty in determining the dialect to which it is to be assigned. Against Meisterhans' suggestion of Ionic stands the opinion of H. W. Smyth (*Ionic Dialect*, p. 609) that its occasional appearances in Ionic are due to Atticising! Certainly ἤν is the ordinary Ionic form, but ἄν may have been Ionic as well, though rarer. (So Mr. P. Giles.)

by all the writers of the New Testament, though in unequal degrees, would naturally be introduced more freely in texts affected by an instinct of popular adaptation." He would be a bold man who would claim that even Hort had said the last word on the problem of the Western Text; but with our new knowledge of the essentially popular character of New Testament Greek as a whole, we shall naturally pay special attention to documents which desert the classical spelling for that which we find prevailing in papyri written by men of education approximately parallel with that of the apostolic writers.

The case of λήμψομαι comes first (p. 142). The intrusion of the μ from the present stem of λαμβάνω into various parts of the verb, and into derivative nouns, is well set after the Ptolemaic period, in which there is still some lingering of the older forms. It is therefore unnecessary to show that the late uncials, in restoring the classical forms, are deserting the unquestioned pronunciation of the first century. The "unusual aspirated forms" (p. 143) ἐφ' ἑλπίδι, καθ' ἰδίαν, ἄφιδε, etc., and οὐχ ὁλίγος are supported by a large body of evidence from papyri. It is rather strange that καθ' ἕτος does not appear in the MSS.; as in the other cases, there is a struggle between the two types, but the modern ἐφέτο shows that the aspirate here triumphed. It is of course impossible to set this phenomenon down to the defunct digamma: it doubtless originates from analogy processes within the *Κοινή* itself (so Thumb), which accounts for the uncertain tradition. We cannot prove either one or the other for the New Testament autographs, but we have already seen good reason for trusting the uncial tradition in places where we have the means of checking it. Occasional deaspiration (p. 144) is part of the general tendency towards psilosis which started from Ionic influences and became universal, as Modern Greek shows. The mention of ταμεῖον (p. 146—add πεῖν from p. 170)

brings up a universal sound-change of Hellenistic, the coalescence of two following *ι* sounds. *Ταμεῖον*, *πεῖν* and *ὑγεία* are overwhelmingly attested by the papyri, where there are only rare examples of a curious reversion like that in Matthew xx. 22. In the form *ἀλεεῖς* (Mark i. 17 *al.*) we have dissimilation instead of contraction. Three isolated spellings on p. 148 are instructive. *'Αραβών* " seems to be only Western." In the papyri I counted 11 exx. of this against 12 of *ρρ*, a curious modification of the results of Deissmann (p. 183), which were obtained from the Berlin and Rainer papyri only. The word will serve as evidence of the inaccessibility of the autographs' spelling except where the papyri are unanimous: cf. Deissmann's observations, p. 181. Next comes *σφυρίς*, which is invariable in the papyri after the Ptolemaic period. *Ζμύρνα* is regarded by W.H. as Western; but though the papyri and inscriptions waver (Deissmann, 185), it surely ought to be transferred from margin to text on the evidence of the first century Smyrnaean coins. The next cases of importance appear on p. 150. *'Ερανυάω* is certain for the first century and after. Hort's account of *τέσσαρες* and *τεσσαράκοντα* gives us our first example of dissonance between the papyri and the uncials. The forms with *ε* are in the papyri relatively few, and distinctly illiterate, in the first centuries A.D. Indeed the evidence for forms of *τέσσερες* is virtually *nil* before the Byzantine age, and there is not the smallest probability that the Apostles wrote anything but the Attic form. For *τεσσεράκοντα* the case is a little better, but it is hopelessly outnumbered by the *-αρ-* form in documents which antedate the uncials; the modern *σεράντα*, side by side with *σαράντα*, shows that the strife continued. No doubt before the fourth century *τέσσερες -α* (not *τεσσέρων*) had begun to establish themselves in the place they hold to-day. Finally might be mentioned one or two notable matters of pronunciation to which Hort does not refer. The less

educated papyrus writers very frequently use *ā* for *αυ*, from the first century B.C. onwards. Its frequent appearance in Attic inscriptions after 74 B.C. is noted by Meisterhans (*Gramm. d. Att. Inschr.*[3] 154). In Luke ii. 1 (*Ἀγούστου*) this pronunciation shows itself, according to ℵ C*Δ; but we do not seem to find *ἀτός*, *ἑατόν*, etc., in the MSS., as we should have expected.[1]

We pass on to the noun flexion (p. 156). Nouns in *-ρᾰ* and participles in *-νῖα* in the papyri regularly form genitive and dative in *-ης -ῃ*, except that *-νίας -νίᾳ* are still found in the Ptolemaic period. Here again the oldest uncials alone—and even they are not without lapses—support the unmistakable verdict of the contemporary documents of the *Κοινή*. It seems best on the whole to regard this as the analogical assimilation of *-ρᾰ* nouns (and—somewhat later and less markedly—*νῖα* participles) to the other *-ᾰ* flexions of the 1st declension, rather than as Ionic survivals.[2] It may be added that as *μάχαιρα* produced *μαχαίρης* on the model of *δόξα* and *δόξης*, so *Νύμφης* as a proper name produced what is best read as *Νύμφᾰ Νύμφᾰν* in nom. and acc. (Col. iv. 15): it is quite feasible to keep the best reading here without postulating a Doric *Νύμφᾶν*, the improbability of which decides Lightfoot for the alternative. The heteroclite proper names, which fluctuate between 1st and 3rd decl., are paralleled by Egyptian place-names in papyri. In contracted nouns and adjectives we have abundant parallels for forms like *ὀστέων*, *χρυσέων*, and for *χρυσᾶν* (formed by analogy of

1 In Modern Greek (see Thumb, *Grammatik*, p. 59) we find *αὐτός* (pronounced *aftós*) side by side with *ἀτός* (obsolete except in Pontos), whence the short form *τό*, etc. There was therefore a dialectic difference in the *Κοινή* itself.

2 In connexion with this I might mention an Ionic *Κοινή* feature which I expected to find more often in New Testament MSS., the spelling *κιθών*, which (like *κύθρα* and *ἐνθαῦτα*) occurs not infrequently in papyri. I can only find in Tischendorf's apparatus *χειθῶνας* D* (Matt. x. 10) and *κιτῶνας* B* (Mark xiv. 63—"ut alibi ℵ," says the editor, but not stating where).

ἀργυρᾶν). The fact that we do not find short forms of nouns in -ιος -ιον (e.g. κύρις, παιδίν) is a noteworthy test of the educational standard of the writers, for the papyri show them even as early as the third century B.C., and always in company with other indications of comparative illiteracy. These forms, the origin of which is as dark as ever, despite the various efforts of Hatzidakis, Brugmann and others to unravel it, ultimately won a monopoly, as modern Greek shows everywhere. Passing lightly over the exact correspondence between uncials and papyri in the accusatives of κλείς and χάρις (p. 157), we may note the case of χεῖραν in John xx. 25 *AB. The great frequency of this formation in uneducated papyri, which adequately foreshadows its victory in modern Greek,[1] naturally produced sporadic examples in the MSS., but it is not at all likely that the autographs showed it, unless possibly in the Apocalypse. Gregory (Tisch.-Gregory, iii. 118 f.) adds notes of forms like ἀσφαλῆν and ποδήρην, which have also papyrus parallels, but could be explained more easily from the analogy of 1st decl. nouns. Μείζων acc. (John v. 36 ABEGMΔ) is a good example of the irrational addition of ν, which seems to have been added after long vowels almost as freely as the equally unpronounced ι.[2] Before leaving the nouns and adjectives we must mention the indeclinable πλήρης, which should be read in Mark iv. 28 (C*, Hort) and Acts vi. 5 (ℵAC*DEHP al.), and is probably to be recognized in John i. 14. Cf. 2 John 8 (L), Mark viii. 19 (AFGM al.), Acts vi. 3 (AEHP al.), xix. 28 (AEL 13), which show that in every New Testament occurrence of an oblique case of this word we find the indeclinable form recognized in good uncials.

[1] It seems most probable that the modern levelling of 1st and 3rd decl. started with this accusative: the ν has vanished again now. See Thumb, *Grammatik*, pp. 28, 35.

[2] Thus ἄλωι is acc. sing., while ἦν (=ἦ) may be subjunctive. For exx. see *Class. Rev.* xviii. 108.

My papyrus citations for this[1] virtually begin, however, with the second century, and I should hardly credit the New Testament autographs with the form. This probably means that in John i. 14 an original πλήρη was corrupted to the vulgar πλήρης in an early copy. Weiss and others would make it depend in sense upon αὐτοῦ, but δόξαν seems more appropriate, from the whole trend of the sentence: the "glory" or "self-revelation" of the Saviour is "full of grace and truth." One may doubt whether it would have occurred to any one to make a parenthesis of -καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα . . . πατρός, had it not been for the supposed necessity of construing πλήρης with a nominative. In fine, we regard the Codex Bezae as having either preserved or successfully restored the true reading.[2]

I might cite very many more noun forms in which the MSS. prove to have retained the genuine Hellenistic, as evidenced by the papyri; but these typical examples will serve. Verbs naturally produce yet more abundant material, but we need not cite it here, as our present purpose is only to show how such a text as Westcott and Hort's, scrupulously reflecting the best uncials, is in all important features, and in most of the minutiae, supported as genuinely Hellenistic by papyrus evidence published long after their text was made—a conclusion valuable because of the criteria it gives us for estimating the general grammatical condition of our texts. Pursuing the order of W.H. *app.*, we pause a moment on the dropped augments, etc., in pp. 161 f., which are well illustrated in papyri. The attachment of 1st

[1] See also C. H. Turner in *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, i. 120 ff. and 561 f.; Radermacher in *Rhein. Mus.*, lvii. 151; Reinhold *De Graecitate Patrum*, 53.

[2] Winer, p. 705, compares the "grammatically independent" πλήρης clause with the nom. in Phil. iii. 19, and Mark xii. 40. Dr. Moulton makes no remark there, but in his joint commentary with Dr. Milligan he accepts the construction of John i. 14 found in the R.V., or permits his colleague to do so. Of course the case for the indeclinable πλήρης was before him only in the LXX. (as Job xxi. 24 BNAC).

aorist endings to 2nd aorists is universal in our *Κοινή* documents, and the MSS. here undeniably reproduce in general the forms of the autographs. Whether the intrusion should be allowed in the imperfect (as *εἶχαν* Mark viii. 7) is more than doubtful, as the papyri give hardly any warrant. The imperfect and aorist 3rd pl. *-οσαν* receives little encouragement, and the 2nd sing. perf. *-ες* still less: they are both marks of illiteracy. The 3rd pl. perf. *-αν* makes a much better show in the papyri, but though already common in Ptolemaic documents can hardly be regarded as established for the New Testament autographs: like the perf. *-ες*, it might be allowed in the Apocalypse. Passing on to contract verbs, we note how the confusion between *-αω* and *-έω* forms (p. 166) are supported by our external evidence, and by Modern Greek. Our first serious revolt from Westcott and Hort will be in the infinitive in *-οῖν* (and by analogy *-ᾶν*). The evidence for it is "small, but of good quality" (p. 166—cf. *Introd.* § 410): it is in fact confined to B*D in Matthew xiii. 32, B* in Mark iv. 32, ℵ* in 1 Peter ii. 15, BD* in Hebrews vii. 5 (where see Tischendorf's note), and a lectionary in Luke ix. 31. This evidence might pass if the object is merely to reproduce the spelling of the scribe of B, but there is absolutely no corroboration that I know of earlier than the date of B itself, except a second century inscription cited in Hatzidakis' *Einleitung*, p. 193.[1] Blass, *Gram.* 48, does not regard the form as established for the New Testament. I can quote against it from centuries 1—4 eleven examples of *-οῦν* in papyri. That *-οῦν* and *-ᾶν* (not *-ᾷν*) are the correct Attic forms may be seen from Meisterhans[3] 175 f., which Hort's hesitation as to *-ᾶν* prompts me to quote: for the reason of the apparent irregularity see Brugmann, *Griech. Gramm.*[3] 61, or Winer-Schmiedel 42. Next may be named for *-αω* verbs the 2nd sing. pres. mid. in *-ᾶσαι* (*καυχᾶσαι, ὀδυν-*

[1] So Winer-Schmiedel, p. 116 (note). There are two other inscriptions cited by Hatzidakis, but without dates.

âσαι), which has been formed afresh in the *Κοινή* with the help of the *-σαι* that answers to 3rd sing. *-ται* in the perfect.[1] It is well paralleled by the early Ptolemaic future *χαριεῖσαι*. I have, unfortunately, no examples of the subjunctive of *-όω* verbs, with which to attack the parsing of *ἵνα ζηλοῦτε* and the like (p. 167). Blass (Kühner[3] i. 2. 587, and *New Testament Gram.* 48) accepts Hort's view that the subjunctive of these verbs became identical with the indicative, just as it always was in the *-άω* verbs. But he, rightly I think, rejects the supposition that *εὐοδῶται* (1 Cor. xvi. 2) is anything but a pres. subj. To read *εὐόδωται*, as perf. indic., is possible, though the editors do not seem by their printing to have favoured that alternative. That it is a perfect subjunctive is extremely unlikely. The parallels on which Hort (p. 172) relies—set forth with important additions in Blass's Kühner, i. 2. 100 f.—do nothing to make it likely that the *Κοινή* had any perf. subj. apart from the ordinary periphrastic form.[2] It is hard, moreover, to see why the present subjunctive is not satisfactory here: see Dr. Findlay's note *in loc.*

The verbs in *-μι* were naturally in Hellenistic pursuing the process of painless extinction which began even in Homeric Greek, and in modern Greek has eliminated everything outside the verb "be." The papyri agree with the New Testament uncials in showing forms like *δύνομαι* and *-έδετο* (as well as *-έδοτο*), and various derivatives from contract verb types. New verbs like *ἱστάνω* are formed, and new tenses like *ἔστᾰκα*, and the doubly augmented form

[1] To suppose this (or *φάγεσαι*, similarly formed from *φάγεται*) genuine survivals of the pre-Greek *-esai*, is a characteristic feat of the antediluvian philology which still frequently does duty in this country.

[2] To argue this would demand a very technical discussion. It is enough to say that the Attic *κεκτῶμαι* and *μεμνῶμαι* are not derivative verbs, and that the three derivative verbs which can be quoted, from Doric, Cretan, and Ionic respectively, are very small encouragement for a supposed *Κοινή* parallel.

ἀπεκατεστάθην is well attested. What is more important the subjunctives διδοῖ and δοῖ are set on a completely satisfactory basis, so that the idea that they are irregular optatives (as they may possibly be in late documents) need trouble us no more. From οἶδα we have as in New Testament the flexion as an ordinary perfect, but there are rarely found survivals of the old forms. Finally there is εἰμί, which shows middle forms ἤμην, etc., and ἤτω parallel with ἔστω, just as in the New Testament.

With this we may leave spelling and inflexions and push on to the syntax, which will compensate the New Testament student, I hope, for the dry bones he has had to be satisfied with in this chapter of our subject. But though the minutiae of accidence may be dull to those who are not professed philologists, it will be allowed that forms must be settled before we can start discussing their uses; and it is also very clear that they give us our surest criteria for localizing texts and for testing the detailed accuracy of our documents. With this plea I hope to be forgiven on promise of an effort to be more interesting next time.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES OF THEMISON.

II.

The First Catholic Epistle of Themison.

It is probable, therefore, that some time between 180 and 185, Themison, the Montanist Bishop of Pepouza, sent forth the Epistle of Eleutherus, as a Catholic Epistle of St. Peter, to the neighbouring churches of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia.

The order of the provinces named has always presented some difficulty. This difficulty is lessened if it was sent off from Pepouza. Pontus lay on the Euxine, at the north-east corner of Asia Minor, on the borders of Armenia Minor. The road to Pontus lay through Ancyra, in Northern Galatia. In Pontus itself Christianity had gained a hold as early as 87 A.D. In 112 Pliny speaks of many renegade Christians at Amisos, the important Greek port of Pontus.[1] In 170 Christianity was widely spread throughout Pontus. Lucian says: "The whole land is quite full of Atheists and Christians."[2] There were many churches under a Metropolitan, who resided at Amastris, to which church a letter was addressed by Dionysius of Corinth. Dionysius had been requested to write by Bacchylides and Elpistus, and in his epistle he treated on the subjects of marriage and chastity and commanded them to receive those who came back after any fall, whether it be delinquency or heresy.[3] Harnack refers to a passage in Hippolytus which proves conclusively that Montanism was established there at the end of the second century, and thus gives reason for inferring that the questions discussed by Dionysius were the Montanist ideas on marriage and discipline. Hippolytus, in his Commentary

[1] Pliny, *Ep.* 96; cp. *Encyc. Bibl.* iii. 3807.
[2] Harnack, *Mission.* p. 473. [3] Eus. *H.E.* iv. 23, 6.

on Daniel, makes mention of a certain Bishop in Pontus, a pious and humble-minded man, who did not give so much heed to the Scriptures as to the visions which he saw. After two or three dreams, at last he addressed the brethren as a prophet. "This I saw, and this will come to pass; know, therefore, brethren, that after a year the judgment will come." They, when they heard his foretelling that the day of the Lord was at hand, began with weeping and mourning night and day to pray the Lord that they might have the coming judgment before their eyes. And so far did fear and terror seize the brethren that they left their lands and fields waste, and most of them sold their possessions. And he said unto them, "If it happen not as I said, let no one believe the Scriptures, but do each as he wishes." The year passed, the prophecy was unfulfilled, the prophet was proved to be a liar, the Scriptures were proved to be true, and the brethren were offended, so that the virgins married and the men went back to their husbandry, and those who had sold their possessions in vain were found at last as beggars.[1] This illustrates the presence of Christianity, if not of Montanism, and the leading motive for placing Pontus first among the provinces to which the letter was addressed by Themison.

Galatia lay between Phrygia and Pontus. It is clear from the anonymous anti-Montanist that Themison had a strong following in the city of Ancyra. "Being recently at Ancyra in Galatia, I found the church there greatly agitated by this novelty. . . . We disputed in the church many days concerning these and other matters separately brought forward by them."[2] One of the opponents of Themison was Zoticus, bishop of the village Comana,[3] identified by Ramsay with Konana (?) to the south-west of Apameia, and within the province of Galatia.[4] Galatia was

[1] Hipp.; cp. Harnack, *Mission.* p. 474.
[2] Eus. *H.E.* v. 16. 4. [3] *Ibid.* v. 16, 17. [4] Ramsay, *Phrygia*, p. 482.

indeed the centre of the Montanist movement, and the primitive Christian ideas of which to some extent it was the survival were maintained far into the third century. Laymen were allowed to teach in the presence of the bishops at Laranda in Isauria, and at Iconium in Pisidia about the year 218.[1] A synod was held in Iconium between 230 and 235 in reference to the movement.[2]

Cappadocia lay to the east of Galatia, south of Pontus. Tertullian, speaking of the judgments which fell upon the persecutors of Christianity, makes mention of Claudius Lucius Herminianus, in Cappadocia, whose wife joined the Christian Church. He was so enraged that he persecuted the Christians, and when struck down by a loathsome disease, said, "Let no one know of it, lest the Christians rejoice, lest the Christian women hope."[3] Harnack dates this persecution between 180 and 196.[4] The special mention of "Christianae" may point to the high position and influence of women among the Christians of Cappadocia. The letter of Themison would have brought encouragement to those who were the victims of this persecution. In the early part of the following century the special features of Cappadocian Christianity come to light. Juliana, the learned virgin of Caesarea, was the friend and hostess of Origen. Firmilian of Caesarea, in his letter to Cyprian, speaks of a prophetess, probably in some way related to the Montanist prophetesses, who stirred up the whole Christian community and gained over to her side a presbyter and a deacon.[5] The efforts of Themison to strengthen his cause in Cappadocia by forwarding to them the letter of Eleutherus was not without result.

Asia had been associated with Phrygia in the letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons. The cradle of Montanism

[1] Eus. *H.E.* vi. 19. 18. [2] Harnack, *Mission.* p. 480.
[3] Tert. ad Scap. 3.
[4] Harnack, *Mission.* p. 468. *Ibid.* p. 469. [5] *Ibid.* 469.

was itself in the province of Asia. There is some evidence of the spread of the Montanist movement to the western parts of the province. Melito was about this time Bishop of Sardis. He was an eunuch, a man whose life was lived in the Holy Ghost. He was a great writer, a Quartodeciman, a man of great weight in the Church. His attitude to Montanism is not altogether clear. He appears to have had leanings towards it and sympathy with it, so much so that Tertullian spoke of him as a prophet.[1] Eusebius numbers him among the orthodox writers of the Church ;[2] but McGiffert notes that there was so much in his writings with which he was not in sympathy that he does little more than mention the titles of his works.[3] His Chiliasm was another point of contact with the Montanists. Themison may have had cause to think that he might win him over wholly to his side.

Thyatira, to the north-west of Sardis, was a Christian city at the beginning of the third century.[4] It was also so strong a centre of Montanist activity that Epiphanius speaks of it as almost wholly given over to Montanism, and quotes the letter to the Angel of the Church at Thyatira in reference to it (Rev. ii. 18). The toleration of the woman "Jezebel," which calleth herself a prophetess, shows the proneness of the Church of Thyatira to this particular phase of the movement.[5] The Acts of Carpas, Papylas and Agathonike, the martyrs of Pergamos (161–169) also show that the soil of Asia was favourable to Montanist ideas. Harnack will not allow that either Papylas, the citizen of Thyatira, or Agathonike were Montanists, but says that the visions which are contained in the Acts and the silence of Eusebius respecting them show that "we are on ground that was favourable to Montanism."[6]

[1] Harn. *Alt. Chr. Litt.* p. 246. [2] Eus. *H.E.* iv. 21.
[3] McGiffert, *Eus.* p. 203. [4] Harn. *Mission.* p. 435.
[5] Epiph. *Haer.* li. 33. [6] Harn. *Chr.* i. 363.

Bithynia lay to the north of Asia, and was united to the province of Pontus. The testimony of Pliny's letter to Trajan is evidence of the strong hold which Christianity had in the provinces in the years 111–113. "Neque civitates tantum sed vicos etiam atque agros superstitionis istius contagio pervagata est; quae videtur sisti et corrigi posse. Certe satis constat prope jam desolata templa coepisse celebrari et sacra solemnia diu intermissa repeti pastumque venire victimarum, cujus ad hoc rarissimus emptor inveniebatur."[1] Beyond this important witness of Pliny the only reference to Bithynia before the time of Origen is the letter of Dionysius of Corinth to the Nicomedians on the heresy of Marcion.[2]

With the exception, therefore, of Bithynia, there is evidence of Montanist activity in all the provinces to which this letter is addressed by Themison.

The recognition of the doctrine of the Trinity, 1 Pet. i. 2, agrees with the testimony of Epiphanius: "They hold with the Catholic Church in their faith in the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost."[3] It is through the Holy Spirit that we attain to obedience and the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. This may account for the precedence given to the Holy Spirit in the passage.

It has been suggested that 1 Peter i. 10–12 is an addition by the author of the opening and closing verses. The thought of *v.* 13 links on directly with that of *v.* 9; and the conception of the work of the Holy Spirit is unique in the New Testament except in 2 Peter i. 19–21. The prophets (1 Pet. i. 10) referred to may therefore be the Christian prophets of the first age to whom the later prophets are compared, as in the Didache (xi. 11). The Spirit of Christ in them testified beforehand of the sufferings of Christ, and the glories which should come after them.

[1] Harn. *Miss.* p. 464.
[2] Eus. *H.E.* iv. 23, 4.
[3] Epiph. *Haer.* lviii. 1.

There is also a contrast between the revelation to these former prophets and the announcement now made through those that preached the Gospel by the Holy Ghost sent forth from heaven. This last phrase is a very strong statement of the personal ministry of the Holy Spirit, and would have special force to those who believed in the claims of the Montanist prophets. The anonymous writer, speaking of the influence of Montanus on his followers, says: "Some imagined themselves possessed of the Holy Ghost and the prophetic gift."[1] The claim of Montanus is recorded in his own words by Epiphanius: "I am the Lord God Almighty come down among men."[2] The prophet thus inspired and moved by the Holy Ghost is more privileged than the angels "who desire to look into the things which are revealed by the Holy Ghost" (v. 12). To this again there is a close parallel in the words of Montanus: "I am come neither as an angel nor as an ambassador, but as the Lord God, the Father."[3]

The opening verses stamp the letter with the apostolic authority of St. Peter. The closing verses introduce the names of Silvanus and Mark. Silvanus is introduced in a very strange phrase in 1 Peter v. 12. He is described as "the faithful brother as I account him." The name, like that of Peter, is certainly pseudonymous. He has been thought to be, jointly with St. Mark, the author of the Epistle;[4] but if Harnack's reasoning for the later date of these verses be accepted, this theory must be given up. Why then is Silvanus named? The form of the name is that found in the Epistles of St. Paul only (2 Cor. i. 19, 1 Thess. i. 1, 2, 2 Thess. i. 1). He is termed in one of these Epistles an apostle of Christ (1 Thess. ii. 6). Nothing is known of him after these Epistles, which date from about

[1] Eus. *H.E.* v. 16, 8.
[2] Epiph. *Haer.* xlviii. 11.
[3] *Ibid.* xlviii. 11.
[4] *Handcomm.* v. Soden, p. 124

54 A.D. There is no evidence of his fellowship with St. Peter beyond that of the First Epistle of St. Peter. He is the Silas of the Acts, the prophet who accompanied St. Paul and St. Barnabas from Jerusalem to Antioch (Acts xv. 27, 32). He was St. Paul's companion through the region of Phrygia and Galatia on his second journey (Acts xv. 40, xvi. 6). He shared his imprisonment at Philippi (Acts xvi. 19, 25, 29). He stayed with Timothy at Berœa while St. Paul went to Athens (xvii. 14). They both rejoined him at Corinth (xviii. 5). There is no record of his accompanying St. Paul when he again passed through the region of Galatia and Phrygia on his way to Ephesus (xviii. 23). The name would appear to be used in this Epistle in memory of his prophetic activity and his authority and work in Phrygia. There is also a further reason. The Montanist prophets claimed descent from him,[1] and his name as a prophet must have been held in high esteem in the Montanist Churches. He added by his name prophetic authority to the apostolic authority of St. Peter.

The "true grace of God" (v. 12) is an unique phrase. It is fitting in the writing of an apologist. "He that is at Babylon, elect together with you, saluteth you" (v. 13). It would be hard to identify Babylon with Rome if the homily had been given its Petrine character in that city. Here it has probably the mystical meaning of the Apocalypse (Rev. xvii. 5). The word "elect city" occurs on the inscription on the tomb of Avircius Marcellus, and refers exoterically to Hierapolis, esoterically to the heavenly city. It shows that the term was familiar at that period.[2]

The addition "and so does Marcus, my son," is also fitting in a district where the tradition of St. Mark as the interpreter of St. Peter has been preserved in the writings of Papias of Hierapolis.

[1] Eus. *H.E.* v. 17, 3.
[2] Ramsay, *Phrygia*, p. 724.

The contact of these verses (1 Pet. i. 1–2, 10–12; v. 12–14) with the ideas of Montanism give some ground for thinking that the Epistle owes its present form and ascription to Themison. He made the fewest possible changes in the text of the Epistle of Eleutherus, and in conformity with the practice of the period issued it with a short introduction and conclusion under the name and with the imprimatur of St. Peter.

The Second Epistle of Themison.

The opposition to Montanism increased between 185 and 195. The anti-Montanist writers charged them with false prophecy, because they broke the tradition of the Church by the frenzy and ecstasy in which they prophesied.[1] They were regarded also as false teachers, opposers of the truth.[2] In consequence of this opposition the Montanists were expelled from the Church and debarred from communion.[3]

The opposition did not come only from the Church authorities. Equally bitter was the hostility of the Alogoi, who rejected the writings of St. John and the Apocalypse.[4]

The burden of responsibility lay, therefore, heavily on Themison. He had to defend his followers against a double attack, for it is impossible to view the Alogoi as a party within the Church. He had also, as an upholder of the true faith, to defend it against the Gnostic and Monarchian heresies which were prevalent in his time in Asia. It was to this end that he wrote a Catholic epistle in defence of the Christian faith. This, in the words of Apollonius, was written "in imitation of the apostle, to instruct those whose faith was better than his own."[5] Does not the Second Epistle of St. Peter agree with the purpose of Themison? It is a Catholic epistle, it is writ-

[1] Eus. *H.E.* v. 16, 4, 7. [2] *Ibid.* 16, 5. [3] *Ibid.* 16, 10.
[4] Neander, *Gesch. der Chr. Rel.*, 1828, i. 667, 668.
[5] Eus. *H.E.* v. 18, 5.

ten in imitation of the Apostle, it is a defence of the faith once for all delivered to the Church, it attacks with vigour the evils of false prophecy and false teaching. It was moreover for nearly two centuries looked upon with suspicion by the Church, its authority as a document valuable as a protest against false teaching being almost confined to Cappadocia and the Alexandrian writers, Clement and Origen, who derived their knowledge of it through Cappadocia.

It takes to some extent the form of a covering letter, enclosing a large portion of the Epistle of Jude. The writer, however, makes freer use of this Epistle than he did of the Epistle of Eleutherus. He published the Eirenicon as the (First) Epistle of St. Peter, with only the smallest additions of his own; in this (Second) Epistle he incorporates the work of Jude into his own work. He is a writer rather than a transcriber.

What are the antecedents of the Epistle of Jude? Harnack[1] and v. Soden[2] agree that it is prior to 2 Peter. The additional reflections on the trial of Lot (2 Pet. ii. 8) and the deliverance of Noah (ii. 5) was a digression from the line of argument with the object of strengthening the faith of those addressed. This sharpening of the purpose speaks decidedly for the priority of Jude 5–7. There is also a softening down in the references to Enoch which proves the priority of Jude.[3]

The object of the Epistle of Jude was to defend the faith, and to refute a certain group of heretical teachers whose ideas were partly libertine (*vv.* 4, 8, 16, 18), partly Gnostic (*v.* 10), and who made claim to visions and revelations, regarding themselves as "pneumatic" in contrast to those who were merely, as they thought, "psychic." The heresy is in advance of any heresy known in apostolic

[1] *Chr.* i. p. 465. [2] *Handcomm.* p. 203.
[3] v. Soden, pp. 221–223.

times, if indeed the reference to the apostles in *v.* 17 did not prove conclusively that these times were long past. He speaks of the faith as "once for all delivered to the saints" (*v.* 3), the "most holy faith" (*v.* 20). It is too definite to be a Catholic epistle, and was addressed to some one Church or group of Churches.[1] V. Soden, who is inclined to attribute it to a younger brother of our Lord, dates it between 80 and 90.[2] Harnack places it between 100 and 130.[3]

He does not think the Carpocratian heresy is referred to, but among the Syrian-Palestinian group of heresies—Gnostics, Phibionites, Kainites, Nicolaitans—he makes special mention of the Archontikoi. These heretics had spread throughout Greater and Lesser Armenia. They had many ideas common to the Gnostic heresies of the neighbouring districts. They denied the resurrection of the flesh; they rejected baptism; they repudiated the Holy Mysteries.[4] The picture which Epiphanius draws is perhaps as much in advance of the false teaching condemned by St. Jude as that is in advance of the heresies of the apostolic age. There are, however, two points of special importance, one of which may have drawn the attention of Themison to this Epistle. The Archontikoi gave prominence to the prophetic gift and they made use of Apocryphal literature. They commemorated two prophets, a certain Martiades and Marsias, who were caught up into heaven and came down again on the third day. "Many other fables they accept, blaspheming God Almighty, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, as the Archon and inventor of all iniquity.[5] They held in high repute two books called the Symphonies, and deduced many arguments from the Ascension of Isaiah and other apocryphal books of the same character.[6]

[1] Harn. *Chr.* i. 465. [2] *Handcomm.* p. 204. [3] *Chr.* i. 468.
[4] Epiph. *Haer.* xl. 2. [5] Epiph. *Haer.* xl. 7. [6] *Ibid.* xl. 2.

The Epistle of Jude points only to the beginning of such a heresy. Its place in the Muratorian Canon suggests that it cannot be in the latter portion of the period 100–170. Harnack thinks that the mention of the Twelve (*v.* 17) points to Palestine as its birthplace, though in the later "Apostolic" Fathers the Twelve are recognized over a larger sphere.[1] He suggests the name of Judas, one of the early bishops of the Jewish Christian Church of Jerusalem, as the author.[2]

But may not the name bear another interpretation? Harnack refutes the idea of v. Soden that the author of the Epistle was the "brother of James"; the late date of the Epistle, its tenor and language are against such an authorship. Jülicher thinks the words may be an interpolation or an episcopal title.[3] The superscription may therefore have been originally "Judas the servant of Jesus Christ." The letter, short as it is, has some analogy with the prophetic spirit which appears in the New Testament Canon. Enoch is referred to as a prophet. Balaam the Prophet is put forth as a warning. Is it a work of the prophetic school of the early part of the second century, written under the pseudonym of Jude the Prophet, the companion of Silas? If this were so, it would be another reason why Themison should have made use of it. Judas is mentioned with Silas in the list of those who are regarded as the forerunners of Montanus.[4] Nothing is known of Judas after he left Antioch. He may have worked in Armenia or Asia Minor, and thus suggested the superscription and authority to the writer of 100–130. Lesser Armenia bordered on Pontus, and its errors may have spread into Pontus and Cappadocia. Themison, when he incorporated the Epistle of Jude into his own Catholic Epistle, was at once giving his support to

[1] Hermas, *Sim.* xvii.
[2] Harn. *Chr.* i. p. 468.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 467.
[4] Eus. *H.E.* v. 17, 3.

previous refutations of heresy, and strengthening it with the imprimatur of St. Peter.

The Montanists accepted the Faith of the Church "nam de Patre et Filio ac Spiritu Sancto eadem cum Ecclesia Catholica sentiunt."[1] They differed chiefly, if not wholly, in the ecstatic manner of their prophecy and the strictness of their life.

The Epistle opens with a recognition of the faith of the Church. It is addressed "to those who have received a like precious faith with us" (2 Pet. i. 1). "Jesus is our Lord whose Divine power hath granted unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness" (i. 3). "He has called us by His own glory and virtue, through which He has given to us His precious and exceeding great promises" (i. 4). The reference is to the coming of the millennial kingdom, "the new heavens and new earth" of the Apocalypse (2 Pet. iii. 13). The Montanists looked for the speedy coming of Christ to set up His Kingdom on earth, and are therefore to be numbered with the Chiliasts.[2]

He sets these privileges before his hearers, adding that through them they may become partakers of the Divine nature, "fleeing from the corruption that is in the world by lust" (i. 4), The reference may be to the privileges which the Montanists believed to be theirs through the indwelling of God, privileges which they wished others to share in to check the progress of corruption.

The great need is moral effort, a stricter standard of morality; they are to give diligence to add to "their faith virtue; to virtue, knowledge; to knowledge, temperance; to temperance, patience; to patience, godliness; to godliness, brotherly love; to brotherly love, charity" (i. 5–7). Thus practice must be added to privilege if the "calling

[1] Epiph. xlviii. 1.
[2] McGiffert, *Eus.* p. 229.

and election is to be sure" (i. 10). The practice of asceticism will ensure an "entrance into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" (*v.* 11). The millennial promises will be fulfilled as the reward of virtue. This hope it was which supported them and encouraged them in their ascetic exercises.

The writer then goes on to strengthen his moral lesson, though he allows that his hearers are themselves established in the truth by the vision of the Transfiguration. He makes it the more impressive by stating his conviction that his end is near. He had had a special vision to warn him of his death: "the putting off of my tabernacle cometh swiftly even as our Lord Jesus Christ signified unto me" (i. 14). The transfiguration is narrated in the form of a vision, the form being suggested perhaps by the visions enjoyed by the Montanist prophets. It is recorded either of Quintilla or Priscilla that, when asleep at Pepouza, Christ appeared to her as a woman, in shining raiment, gave her wisdom, and revealed to her that Pepouza was the holy place, and that there Jerusalem was to come down from heaven.[1] The writer, however, is anxious to avoid extravagancies, and records the vision as nearly as possible in the traditional manner. "We did not follow cunningly devised fables when we made known unto you the power and presence of our Lord Jesus Christ, but we were eye-witnesses of His majesty" (i. 16).

The description of the vision is followed by the praise of prophecy. "We have the prophetic word the more sure, to which ye do well to take heed, as to a light shining in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day-star shine in your hearts; knowing this first of all, that no prophecy of Scripture is of private interpretation, but those who were moved by the Holy Ghost spake as men from God" (i. 19–21). The claim to the prophetic word is as strongly

[1] Epiph. *Haer.* xlix.

worded as is the passage in 1 Peter i. 12, and may be compared with the words of Montanus: "Behold a man is as a lyre, and I flutter as a plectron. The man sleeps and I watch. Behold the Lord is He who excites the hearts of men, and giveth men hearts." [1]

Such is the introduction—a recognition of the true faith, an exhortation to virtue, a defence of the prophetic gift. The central portion of the Epistle consists of an attack on false prophecy, in which is incorporated the words of the Epistle of Jude. This false prophecy, the raving perhaps of prophets like those of the Archontikoi, was associated with false teaching, teaching contrary to the Christian faith and the customs of the Christian Church. "There are false prophets also among the people, as among you also there shall be false teachers, who privily bring in destructive heresies, denying even the Master that bought them, bringing upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their lascivious doings, by reason of which the way of the truth shall be evil spoken of" (ii. 1–2). The denial of Holy Baptism, and the recognition of the God Sabaoth as author of the Law, which were among the errors of the Archontikoi, were such a denial of the Master who bought them." [2]

The judgments of Jude, when once the deliverance from Egypt is recorded (*v.* 5), are unrelieved with a touch of mercy (6–16). The judgments of 2 Peter are brightened by the mercies shown to Noah (ii. 5) and to Lot (ii. 7–8). The judgments are three: the rebel angels, the old world before the flood, the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah (ii. 4–8). They are brought forward as much to comfort the godly in their trials as to warn the ungodly in their wickedness (ii. 9). It is perhaps to the libertinism of the Archontikoi,[3]

[1] Epiph. *Haer.* xlviii. 4
[2] Epiph. *Haer.* xl. 2.
[3] *Ibid.* xl. 2.

and other heretics of the same type, that the stern language of denunciation which is based upon and enlarged from the Epistle of Jude is applied. The addition "having eyes full of adultery, and that cannot cease from sin; enticing unsteadfast souls; having a heart exercised in covetousness; children of cursing" (ii. 14) is of special interest when read along with the charges of Apollonius and other anti-Montanist writers. Montanus was accused of having been beguiled by the artifice and craft of the devil.[1] Apollonius says that Themison himself was clothed with plausible covetousness.[2] The Balaam incident is enlarged by reference to the rebuke of the madness of the prophet (xii. 16); the "way of Cain," and the "gainsaying of Korah" are omitted. The writer, while defending the prophecy, wishes to defend himself and his followers from the charge of frenzy and madness brought against them by their enemies. The writer then passes away from the latter part of the judgment of Jude, omitting all reference to Enoch, and emphasizes the dangers of apostasy. The evil teachers were by their lasciviousness enticing those who were "just escaping from those that live in error" (ii. 18), promising them liberty, while they themselves were bond-servants of corruption (ii. 19). The temptation must have been strong in a condition of society where the Church was rapidly becoming worldly. Those who were endeavouring to live the ascetic life which Montanus and his followers advocated would be specially liable to these promises of freedom, whether made by Churchmen or by Gnostics. They needed not only the promises of the new coming of Christ, but the authoritative encouragement of their leaders to keep them firm. "For if after they have escaped the defilement of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again

[1] Eus. *H.E.* v. 16, 9. [2] *Ibid.* v. 18, 5.

entangled therein and overcome, the last state is become worse than the first" (ii. 20).

He then reverts to the promise of the Kingdom which formed the basis of encouragement in the first chapters. He speaks of this as his second Epistle (iii. 1) and reminds them that the holy prophets and apostles had already spoken of these promises. It was necessary to repeat it because of the doubts of the mockers: "Where is the promise of His coming? for since the fathers fell asleep all things remain as from the beginning of the world" (iii. 2–4). The Montanists based much of their Chiliastic belief on the Apocalypse of St. John; Papias, of Hierapolis, agreed with them in this belief.[1] It was perhaps on this ground that the Alogoi rejected the Apocalypse.[2]

Is there any key to the era referred to, "the falling asleep of the fathers," the close of the apostolic age? Epiphanius, in his book on the Alogoi, made use of an earlier treatise against the heresy which has been attributed to Hippolytus.[3] In this earlier treatise a limit of ninety-three years is given to the apostolic age from 29 A.D. to 122 A.D.[4] It may be that the year 122 was the date of the death of the daughters of Philip, the last survivors of the age of the Apostles in Asia Minor,[5] and that this is the era referred to in 2 Peter iii. 4. The presence of a definite era in this Epistle and in the anti-Alogist writer in Epiphanius strengthens the view that the author of 2 Peter is at least living in surroundings similar to those of the Alogoi, if indeed he is not actually refuting the Alogoi themselves.

The writer then endeavours to meet their objections, and to prove to them that the rejection of the Apocalypse

[1] Eus. *H.E.* iii. 39, 12. [2] Epiph. *Haer.* li. 33.
[3] Harn. *Chr.* i. 378.
[4] Epiph. *Haer.* li. 33. [5] Harn. *Chr.* i. 378.

of St. John is not fatal to the cause of Chiliasm he quotes the authority of the Apocalypse of Peter. Harnack emphasizes the parallelism in character and expression between 2 Peter iii. 5–12 and the Apocalypse of Peter, and decides upon the priority of the latter, which he dates 110–160.[1] Whether it belongs to the same circle as the Epistles of St. Peter is uncertain. But there are certain points of contact between this second Epistle of St. Peter and the Apocalypse which bear upon the question. The writer of the Apocalypse condemns certain Christians who slander the way of righteousness; the writer of the Epistle says: "It were better for them not to have known the way of righteousness" than to apostatize (ii. 21). Again, in the opening verses of the Apocalypse: "Many false prophets there will be from among them, who will teach the ways and manifold doctrine of perdition; and they shall become sons of perdition." The writer of the Epistle uses the same language, "There are false prophets also among the people who shall privily bring in sects of perdition" (ii. 1). The same group of ideas is found in the letter of Vienne and Lyons: "As sons of perdition they blasphemed the way through their apostasy."[2] The sympathy of the Gallic martyrs with the Montanists, the Jewish affinities of early Chiliasm, the Jewish ideas of the Montanist prophet, are grounds for suggesting that the Apocalypse of Peter belongs to the same group of writers who, out of their reverence for the Apostle of the Circumcision, put forth the two Epistles under his name. Harnack is not able to discover any connexion between 2 Peter and the Kerugma Petri, but adds in a note: "That there is a reference to the Kerugma in 2 Peter i. 15 is a possibility which unfortunately cannot be established with

[1] Harn. *Chr.* i. 470–472.
[2] Eus. v. 1, 48.

certainty, but is nevertheless attractive."[1] It may be added that it was in Hierapolis that the Gospel of St. Mark was held to have the imprimatur of St Peter."[2] Was there in Asia and Phrygia a Jewish Christian community which formed a collection of Petrine writings, Gospel, Preaching, Epistles, and Apocalypse ?

The writer, having met the objections of his opponents, perhaps the Alogoi, who repudiated the millennial expectations, sums up his own hope in the words of the Apocalypse of St. John : "But, according to His promise, we look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2 Peter iii. 13 ; cp. Rev. xxi. 1).

He does not wish to fall into the error of the Alogoi in rejecting any works of apostolic authorship. He will not have it thrown against him that, if he accuses the Alogoi of rejecting the evidence of St. John, he himself is guilty of overthrowing that of St. Paul. He does not wish his followers to suppose that the Church leaders alone have a monopoly in their reverence for the Pauline Epistles. He wishes them to be taken in their true sense, and not perverted in any way by those who out of respect for them may drive their exegesis too far. There were some evidently who wrested the meaning of St. Paul's words to their own ends. Who would be so likely to do so as the followers of Avircius Marcellus, who called himself the follower of St. Paul? The writer of 2 Peter accepts, therefore, whole-heartedly against every phase of doubt the Epistles of St. Paul : "Wherein are some things hard to be understood, which the ignorant and unsteadfast wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own perdition" (2 Pet. iii. 16).

The Epistle ends, as it began, in hope of the Great Day in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ : "Grow in grace,

[1] *Chr.* i. 474. [2] Papias ap. Eus. *H.E.* iii. 39, 15.

and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to whom be glory, both now and unto the Day of Eternity " (iii. 18).

Such is in outline the second Epistle of Peter. McGiffert, writing of the Catholic Epistle of Themison; says : " The Epistle is no longer extant. Its blasphemy against the Lord and His Apostles lay undoubtedly in its statement of the fundamental doctrine of the Montanists, that the age of revelation had not ceased, but that through the promised Paraclete revelations were still given which supplemented or superseded those granted the Apostles of Christ." [1] The claim of 2 Peter is a very strong one : " We have the word of prophecy made more sure " (i. 19). There are, even to-day, many to whom it is a shock that any but an eye-witness should be bold enough to describe himself as " an eye-witness to the majesty of Christ " (i. 16). And it would appear from the history of the Epistle in the early Church that its boldness was the great stumbling-block to its acceptance. If this be taken into account, do not the words of Apollonius characterize the Epistle very faithfully, " Themison, though he should have been humble on the account of covetousness (ii. 14), dared to boast as a martyr (i. 14), and in imitation of the Apostle (i. 1, 18), he wrote a certain Catholic Epistle (iii. 1) to instruct those whose faith was better than his own (i. 1), contending for words of empty sound (ii. 10–12, 17–18) and blasphemy against the Lord (i. 16), and the Apostles (iii. 2), and the Holy Church (iii. 15–16)." [2]

Is there any further evidence for the identification of this Epistle ? It has been said of the Jews of Phrygia that they did not adopt the philosophy and education of the Alexandrian Jews.[3] The independence of the writer of Alexandrian

[1] McGiffert, *Eus.* p. 235.

[2] Eus. *H.E.* v. 18, 5.

[3] Ramsay, *Phrygia*, p. 671.

ideas is traceable in the language of the Epistle. There are in the additional verses in 1 Peter and in 2 Peter forty-two words not found elsewhere in the canon. Twenty-two of these words do not occur at all in the LXX; six are absent from the LXX version of the Hebrew Scriptures; ten are not found in classical use. The reference to the proverb in Proverbs xxvi. 11, departs from the LXX reading and introduces a non-classical word in its place (ii. 22). Mr. Falconer says: "There is no trace of Alexandrianism in his thought. Imagery and ideas are Hebraic. It is evidently written by a Hebrew, who often limps in his attempts at Greek style." [1] If the Jews of Phrygia had forgotten their language, they had not so far emancipated themselves from their own turn of expression as not to colour the language of their adoption.

Another clue to the Phrygian origin of the Epistle is the reference to the judgment of the Flood (i. 5). This is not mentioned among the judgments of Jude, though referred to in another context in 1 Peter iii. 20.[2] Ramsay has brought some important evidence to bear on the Legend of the Flood in Apameia. "On Apamean coins struck under Severus, Macrinus and Philip there appears the same type of a chest or ark inscribed *ΝΩΕ*, floating on water; within it are two figures, and standing beside it a male and female figure. On the top of the chest a raven, and above a dove carrying an olive branch." Reasons have been stated for the belief that the coin engravers used as their models a picture exhibited in a public place in the city, probably one of a series of illustrations of Apamean legends which adorned some public buildings, such as a stoa. Some time during the second century, probably an artist represented the tale of Noah as

[1] Expositor, July, 1902, p. 47.

[2] It has been suggested since the publication of the first part in July that *vv.* 19–22 break the sequence of thought between 1 Pet. iii. 18 and 1 Pet. iv. 1. It may be therefore that the reference to the Flood in both Epistles is due to Themison.

an Apamean scene. "It is known from other sources that the legend of Noah was localized at Apameia. The Sybilline books refer to the ark as having rested on the hill where the Marsyas rises, and there is some connexion between the by-name of the Kibotos and the legend of the Flood."[1] The hill of Kelainai was considered by the Apamean Jews to be the spot where the ark had rested.[2] This addition of the flood to the judgments of Jude would be natural, therefore, to a Phrygian writer.

Another link with Asia is the use of the term ἀρετή and θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως. Ἀρετή and θεία δύναμις are current in the inscriptions of Caria.[3] An inscription of the Phrygian Pentapolis at Brouzos speaks of τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ θεοῦ, which may be compared with ἐπόπται τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος (2 Pet. i. 16).[4]

It must appear at first a difficulty that a group of Montanist writings should have been gradually admitted into the Canon of Scripture. If, as seems proved, they belong at least to the period of the Montanist movement, and are so very closely linked in with Phrygia, is it not more likely that they are both of them works of the Catholic authorities in the Church? The inscription of Avircius, the leading opponent of Montanism, seems to answer this question most decidedly in the negative. The Catholic Church was Pauline in its origin, and loyal to the authority of the Apostle of the Gentiles. It would not have issued its apology under the aegis of St. Peter.

And if it had done so, would not the second Epistle have had a safer place in the canon? Tertullian quotes the first Epistle by the name of Peter; Irenaeus quotes it by name; so also does Clement of Alexandria; none of these writers are, however, independent of Asiatic influence. No question

[1] Ramsay, *Phrygia*, p. 669. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 670–1.
[3] Falconer, Expositor, July 1902, p. 56.
[4] Ramsay, *Phrygia*, p. 700.

was afterwards raised as to its authenticity.[1] The evidence with regard to the second Epistle is very different. No trace of it is to be found in early Christian literature. The Peschito admitted 1 Peter but excluded 2 Peter. "Neither the Epistle of Barnabas, nor Justin Martyr, nor Theophilus of Antioch, nor Irenaeus can be fairly adduced as citing or alluding to our Epistle . . . Neither does Tertullian, nor Cyprian, nor Clement of Alexandria in any of his extant works."[2] The silence of the Muratorian fragment is impressive, for the writer specially rejects the works of the Montanists; and if this canon was formed amid the controversies of Caius and Proclus, the silence is still more significant. The Epistles, being in high esteem by the Montanists, would be rejected, especially at Rome, by the Church.

The evidence as to Origen is conflicting, though of importance owing to his residence in Cappadocia and his connexion with Firmilian and Alexander in Cæsarea and Jerusalem. In the works which have survived in the Latin version of Rufinus, it is quoted by name as scripture. "In his extant Greek works we nowhere find the Epistle quoted. Nay, it is more than once by implication excluded from the number of the Catholic epistles."[3] It is clear, however, on the testimony of Rufinus, that Origen was acquainted with and somewhat doubtful as to its origin.

Traces of it are found in the Philosophoumena. The early life and birthplace of Hippolytus are wrapped in obscurity. He was, however, in his early life associated with Irenaeus. "It is hardly possible to read any considerable fragment of his other extant works (other, i.e., than the Compendium and Philosophoumena) without stumbling upon some thought or mode of expression which

[1] v. Soden, *Handcomm.* p. 115.
[2] Alford, vol. iv. p. 149.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 151.

reminds us of Irenaeus or the Asiatic elders. When and where was this communication held? Hippolytus might himself have migrated, like Irenaeus, from Asia Minor in early life: and thus the instructions which he received from his master may have been given in his original Asiatic home. But his extant writings contain no trace that he was ever in the East; and we therefore look to Rome itself."[1] It is difficult to trace his exact position in Rome. In the following century he was accused of the Novatian heresy. Lightfoot has shown that this was chronologically impossible.[2] But may there not be reference to his leaning towards the Montanist heresy?

The two had much in common, and the affinity in later times in the Asiatic Churches was so marked that an adherent of the Montanist heresy might have been called an adherent of the Novatian. It is no longer possible to consider him the author of the Dialogue with the Montanist Proclus. Lightfoot attempted it,[3] but Harnack proves that the authorship of Caius is established.[4] Had this dialogue been by him, it would not be possible to regard him as in sympathy with Montanism. But there is proof that Hippolytus wrote certain "Capita adversus Caium,"[5] the anti-Montanist champion in Rome; and that in the refutation he dismisses the heresy of Montanism very briefly.[6] His character as revealed to us in the Philosophoumena is that of a strictly, even rigidly, moral man of a puritanic disposition, who believed in drawing the rein very tight, and allowing to the members of the Christian Church no licence.[7] The evidence for 2 Peter in the Philosophoumena is not therefore independent of Montanist influence.

[1] Lightfoot, *Clem. Rom.* ii. p. 422.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 427.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 380.
[4] *Alt. Chr. Lit.* i. p. 601.
[5] *Ibid.* pp. 602, 624.
[6] Lightfoot, *Clem. Rom.* ii. p. 385.
[7] McGiff. *Eus.* p. 270.

The evidence of Firmilian, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, is of equal importance. He was familiar with the first and second Epistles of St. Peter as having been addressed to the Church of Cappadocia, of which Cæsarea was the Metropolitan See. His words in the Latin version are these: "Petrum et Paulum beatos apostolos . . . qui in epistolis suis haereticos execrati sunt, et ut eos evitemus monuerunt." The reference certainly includes 2 Peter, seeing that it is in this only that heretics are inveighed against by St. Peter.[1] It has already been stated that the Epistle of Jude was written against a type of heresy which is most closely akin to that of the Archontikos of Armenia. The Petrine version of that Epistle in the Catholic Epistle of Themison met the special form of this heresy prevalent in the Church of Cappadocia. The Bishops of Cæsarea, familiar on the one hand with the Montanist-Novatian communities, on the other with the Gnostic and Antinomian heresies, were well able to dis-distinguish between them. The former were orthodox in their faith, if rigid in their discipline; the latter were unorthodox and licentious. Half a century had enabled the Church of Cappadocia to see the true value and inspiration of the Epistles of St. Peter. They recognized their importance as a refutation of heresy and a defence of the faith, and under the direction of the two great bishops, Alexander and Firmilian, successively Bishops of Cappadocia in the first half of the third century, admitted the Epistles into the Cappadocian Canon.

The letter, though received by these bishops at a time when heresy pressed heavily on the Church, was not even then quite assured in the Cappadocian Church. St. Gregory Nazianzen a century later writes: "Some say there are seven Catholic epistles; some say that only three ought to be received."[2]

[1] Alford, vol. iv. p. 151. [2] Alford, iv. p. 152.

Eusebius reckons it among the antilegomena[1]; St. Jerome says: "a plerisque negatur."[2] St. Cyril of Jerusalem, who may have inherited the Cappadocian tradition through his predecessor Alexander, though himself a most virulent opponent of the Montanist heresy—if indeed he knew of it except through its most violent opponents—quotes the second Epistle: "According to the blessed Peter, we become partakers of the divine nature."[3] It was finally admitted into the Canon at the Council of Hippo in 393.[4]

THOMAS BARNS.

[1] Eus. *H.E.* iii. 3, 1, 25, 3.
[2] *St. Jer. de vir. ill.* i.
[3] *Cat. Lect.* xxii. 3.
[4] McGiffert, *Eus.* p. 133.

TRANSLATIONS FROM THE PROPHETS.

X.

Jeremiah XXV.

Chap. XXV. Jeremiah, in accordance with the view to which he was led by the defeat of the Egyptians at Carchemish, B.C. 605 (see the introduction to ch. 46), that the Chaldeans were destined to become the rulers of Western Asia, declares here, first that Judah and the surrounding nations (*vv.* 1–14), and afterwards that the then known world generally (*vv.* 15–38) will be subject to them for seventy years.

How the People had refused to listen to the Warnings of the Prophets.

XXV. [1] The word that came to Jeremiah concerning all the people of Judah in the fourth year of Jehoiakim,* the son of Josiah, king of Judah (the same was the first year of Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon); [2] the which Jeremiah the prophet spake unto all the people of Judah, and to all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, saying: [3] From the thirteenth year of Josiah, the son of Amon, king of Judah, even unto this day, now three and twenty years,† the word of Yahweh hath come unto me, and I have spoken unto you, rising early and speaking; but ye have not hearkened. [4] And Yahweh hath sent unto you all his servants the prophets, rising early and sending them,—though ye have not hearkened, nor inclined your ear to hear,—[5] saying, 'Return, I pray you, every one from his evil way, and from the evil of your doings, and dwell in the land that Yahweh hath given unto you and to your fathers, from of old and even for evermore: ‡ [6] and go not after other gods to serve them, and to worship them, and vex me not with the work of your hands; and I will do you no hurt.' [7] But ye hearkened not unto me, saith Yahweh, that ye might vex me with the work of your hands to your own hurt.§

* B.C. 604.
† I.e. from B.C. 626 to 604.
‡ Cf. 7. 7.
§ Cf. 7. 6 *end.*

Judah, therefore, not less than the neighbouring Countries, will be laid waste by the Chaldeans, and be subject to them for seventy Years.

[8] Therefore thus saith Yahweh of hosts: Because ye
have not heard my words, [9] behold, I will send and take all
the families of the north, saith Yahweh, *and (I will send)
unto Nebuchadrezzar the king of Babylon, my servant,* and
will bring them against this land, and against the in-
habitants thereof, and against all these nations round
about; and I will utterly destroy them,† and make them
an appalment and an hissing, and perpetual wastes.‡
[10] And I will take § from them the voice of mirth, and the
voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom, and the voice
of the bride, the sound of the millstones,‖ and the light of
the lamp. [11] And this whole land shall be a waste, and an
appalment; and these nations shall serve the king of
Babylon seventy years.

[[12] And ¶ it shall come to pass, when seventy years are

* This clause is omitted in LXX, perhaps rightly; the ellipsis in the Heb. of 'I will send' being unusual and awkward.

† Heb. *I will ban* (or *devote*) *them.* Cf. Deut. 2. 34, 3. 6, 7. 2, 20. 17, 1 Sam. 15. 3, 8, etc. The LXX have, *I will waste them* (one letter different [see the same variant in Isa. 11. 15, Heb. and LXX, cf. R.V.m.]); cf. Isa. 60. 12.

‡ The LXX have, *and a perpetual reproach* (חרפת for חרבת): cf. 29. 18.

§ Heb. *I will cause to perish.*

‖ Which is heard daily in an eastern village, and is a sign of the presence of life in it (cf. Rev. 18. 22). The hand-mill (which is what is here meant) consists of two circular stones, eighteen inches or two feet in diameter, the lower one being fixed on the ground, while the upper one is turned round by a woman—or often (cf. Matt. 24. 41) by two women—kneeling or sitting beside it. See Robinson, *B.R.*, i. 485; Thomson, *L. and B.*, Southern Pal. p. 107 (in the one vol. ed. p. 526 f.); or Whitehouse, *Primer of Hebrew Antiquities*, p. 70 f.

¶ *Vv.* 12–14, or, in any case, *vv.* 13–14, cannot have formed part of the original prophecy of Jeremiah delivered in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, but must have been added when the book of Jeremiah was completed, and stood substantially in its present form. For (1) *v.* 15 f. (notice 'For') give the reason, not for *vv.* 12–14 (the punishment, after seventy years, of Babylon), but for *v.* 11 (the subjugation of Judah and surrounding nations to Babylon); and (2) the terms of *v.* 13 presuppose the completion of Jeremiah's book, and in particular the inclusion in it of the prophecy

accomplished, that I will punish the king of Babylon, and that nation, saith Yahweh, for their iniquity,* and the land of the Chaldeans; and I will make it desolate for ever.† [13] And I will bring upon that land all my words which I have pronounced against it, even all that is written in this book, which Jeremiah hath prophesied against all the nations. [14] For many nations and great kings shall serve themselves of them,‡ even of them: and I will recompense them according to their deeds, and according to the work of their hands.]

Jeremiah (in a Vision) gives the Cup of Yahweh's Fury to the Nations to drink. §

[15] For thus said Yahweh, the God of Israel, unto me: Take the cup of the wine (of) this fury from my hand, and cause all the nations, to whom I send thee, to drink it. [16] And they shall drink, and reel to and fro, and be mad, because of the sword that I will send among them. [17] And I took the cup from Yahweh's hand, and made all the nations to drink, unto whom Yahweh had sent me: [18] (to

against Babylon in 50. 1–51. 58, which, in all probability, is not by Jeremiah at all, and, even if it is, was certainly not incorporated in the book of his prophecies till long after B.C. 604 (the short prophecy against Babylon in 51. 59–64 is assigned by its title to the fourth year of Zedekiah, B.C. 593). *V.* 12 is based most probably upon 29. 10, and (at the end) upon 51. 26, 62: *v.* 13 refers expressly to the prophecies against the nations contained in chaps. 46–51, and esp. to chaps. 50–51; *v.* 14 is based upon 27. 7*b*, and 50. 29, 51. 24. Cf. Davidson, *D.B.*, ii. p. 574.

* Heb. *visit upon the king*, etc., *their iniquity*.

† Heb. *perpetual desolations* (the same expression as in 51. 26, 62).

‡ I.e. employ them as slaves or servants (so chap. 27. 7). Lit. *work* or *labour by* (means of) *them*: in Exod. 1. 14 paraphrased by 'make them serve'; in Lev. 25. 46 by 'take bondmen of them,' and in Jer. 22. 13 by 'use the services of . . .'

§ The intoxication which this cup is represented as producing is a figure for the bewilderment and helplessness produced upon a nation by an overwhelming calamity; in the present case (*v.* 16*b*) by the sword of the Chaldeans. Cf. the same figure in 48. 26; Isa. 51. 17, 21–23; Ps. 60. 3.

wit,) Jerusalem, and the cities of Judah, and the kings thereof, (and) the princes thereof, to make them a waste, an appalment, an hissing, and a curse; * [19] Pharaoh king of Egypt, and his servants, and his princes, and all his people; [20] and all the mixed people,† and all the kings of the land of Uz,‡ and all the kings of the land of the Philistines, and Ashkelon, and Gaza, and Ekron, and the remnant of Ashdod;§ [21] Edom, and Moab, and the children of Ammon; [22] and all the kings of Tyre, and all the kings of Zidon, and the kings of the coastland which is beyond the sea;‖ [23] Dedan, and Tema, and Buz,¶ and all them that have the corners (of their hair) clipped; ** [24] and all the kings of Arāb, †† and all the kings of the mixed people ‡‡

* So LXX. The Heb. text adds, *as it is this day*, words which, describing, as they do, the agreement of the prediction with the fulfilment, could not have formed part of the prophecy of Jehoiakim's fourth year, but must have been added at some period after B.C. 586, during the exile.

† I.e., probably, the mixed foreign population, settled in Egypt for trade or other purposes. Cf. the same expression in Ezek. 30. 5, and (of foreigners settled in Babylon) in Jer. 50. 37; see also the note on chap. 46. 16.

‡ The name of an Aramæan tribe settled probably somewhere on the east or north-east of Edom: cf. Lam. 4. 21; Job 1. 1; and see also Gen. 10. 23, 22. 21, 36. 28.

§ I.e., probably, such as survived after the long siege—according to Herodotus (ii. 159), of twenty-nine years—which Ashdod had recently sustained at the hands of the Egyptian king, Psammetichus (B.C. 666–610).

‖ I.e. Phœnician colonies on the coasts of the Mediterranean sea.

¶ Three tribes of north Arabia,—the name Têma (Isa. 21. 14; Job 6. 19) being preserved in the modern *Teimā*, a place about 250 miles south-east of Edom; Dĕdān (Gen. 10. 7; Ezek. 27. 20, 38. 13) being a tribe in the same neighbourhood (cf. Isa. 21. 13), and Buz being a tribe closely allied to 'Uz' (see Gen. 22. 21; cf. 'Elihu the *Buzite*,' Job 32. 2).

** See on 9. 26.

†† Another tribe (or group of tribes) somewhere in north Arabia: cf. Isa. 21. 13. The name, it is probable, means properly *steppe* (עֲרָבָה) *dwellers*; in course of time it came to be limited to a particular tribe, or group of tribes, dwelling in the steppes of north Arabia; then, after Old Testament times, it was gradually extended so as to denote the whole of what we now know as 'Arabia.' But in the Old Testament the rend. 'Arabia' suggests far more than what is really meant. See further Nöldeke's art. 'Arabia' in the *Enc Bibl.*

‡‡ Another local 'mixed population,' whose home was the wilderness,—

that dwell in the wilderness; [25] and all the kings of Zimri,* and all the kings of Elam, and all the kings of the Medes; [26] and all the kings of the north, far and near, one with another, and all the kingdoms † that are upon the face of the earth: § and the king of Sheshach ‡ shall drink after them.§ [27] And thou shalt say unto them, Thus saith Yahweh of hosts, the God of Israel: Drink ye and be drunken and spue, and fall and rise no more, because of the sword which I am sending among you. [28] And it shall be, if they refuse to take the cup from thine hand to drink, that thou shalt say unto them, Thus saith Yahweh of hosts: Ye shall surely drink. [29] For, lo, with the city over which my name hath been called || do I begin by doing evil, and should *ye* be utterly unpunished? Ye shall not be unpunished: for a sword am I calling upon all the inhabitants of the earth, saith Yahweh of hosts.

A figurative and hyperbolical Description of what Yahweh will accomplish in the World by the Agency of the Chaldeans.

[30] And thou, prophesy thou against them all these words, and say unto them: Yahweh shall roar ¶ from on high, and utter his voice from his holy habitation; he shall mightily roar against his homestead; ** with a shout †† shall

unless, indeed, as many commentators suppose, the words 'and all the kings of the mixed people' are a faulty repetition of the preceding clause (in the unpointed Heb. text 'mixed people' is identical with 'Arāb').

* A tribe not mentioned elsewhere.

† So LXX. The Heb. text adds *of the earth*, both tautologically, and also so as to produce at the same time an ungrammatical construction.

‡ I.e. *Babel* (Babylon), written in the cypher called *Atbash*, the last letter of the Heb. alphabet (*T*) being put for the first (*A*), the last but one (*SH*) for the second (*B*), and so on. Cf. 51. 1, 41.

§ This clause is not expressed by the LXX.

|| In token of ownership, cf. on 7. 10.

¶ Viz. like a lion, cf. Am. 1. 2.

** Fig. for Judah, cf. 10. 25, 23. 3.

†† Or, *a huzzah*. The word (Heb. *hedad*) is specially used of the joyous shouts with which the vintagers trod the juice out of the grapes in the

he answer, as they that tread (the grapes), against all the inhabitants of the earth. [31] The din * (of battle) is come even to the end of the earth; for Yahweh hath a controversy with the nations, he contendeth in judgement with all flesh; as for the wicked, he hath given them to the sword, saith Yahweh. [32] Thus saith Yahweh of hosts, Behold, evil goeth forth from nation to nation, and a great tempest shall be stirred up from the uttermost corners of the earth.† [33] And the slain of Yahweh shall be in that day from one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth: they shall not be bewailed, neither gathered, nor buried, they shall be for dung upon the face of the ground.

Let Kings and Nobles wail over the Doom that is about to fall upon them.

[34] Howl, ye shepherds, ‡ and cry; and sprinkle you (with ashes), ye noble ones of the flock: for your days to be slaughtered are accomplished; and ye shall be dashed in pieces § and fall like a precious vessel. || [35] And the shepherds shall have no way to flee, ¶ and none shall escape of

winepress (see Isa. 16. 10; Jer. 48. 33). Here it is used of the war-shout (cf. Jer. 51. 14, where the Heb. word is the same) with which, by a bold anthropomorphism, Jeremiah pictures Yahweh as treading down the nations of the earth.

* Or, *crash*.

† Varied from 6. 22, with the one substitution of 'tempest' for 'nation.'

‡ Fig. of rulers, as 2. 8, 10. 21, etc. The 'noble ones of the flock' are here fig. of the principal and wealthiest men of the nations ruled by the 'shepherds.'

§ So Pesh. (cf. 13. 14). Or, *and I will dash you in pieces* might be read. The Heb. text has a peculiar form, which is very doubtfully rendered, *I will scatter you*.

|| The expression 'be dashed in pieces,' and the comparison to a broken vessel, are not in keeping with the figure of the sheep; and it is a question whether we should not read for the whole of this clause, with LXX, *and ye shall fall like choice lambs* (with omission of ונפצתם 'and ye shall be dashed in pieces,' as a faulty anticipation of ונפלתם 'and ye shall fall,' and with ככרי for ככלי).

¶ Heb. *refuge shall perish from the shepherds*,—an idiomatic expression found also in Am. 2. 14; Job 11. 20; Ps. 142. 4 (Heb. 5).

the noble of the flock. [36] Hark! a cry of the shepherds, and the howling of the noble of the flock! for Yahweh is laying waste their pasture. [37] And the peaceful meadows shall be brought to silence because of the fierce anger of Yahweh. [38] He hath forsaken his covert, as a lion: for their land is become an appalment, * because of the oppressing sword,† and because of his fierce anger.

NOTES.

XXV. 15. (*of*) *this fury*. For the construction (apposition), see G.-K. § 131 *c*, *k*; and cf. Ps. 60. 5, 1 Kings 22. 27.

S. R. Driver.

* Or, *a desolation*. The meaning is, Judah being now a desolation, Yahweh is obliged to leave it, just as a lion has to leave its lair when it has been destroyed. The past tenses are, of course, 'prophetic' pasts.

† So LXX. Targ. (one letter changed). See 46. 16, 50. 16. The Heb. text is not translatable (notice the *italics* in R.V.).

THE LETTER TO THE CHURCH IN PERGAMUM.

In this letter, the intimate connexion between the Church and the city, and the appropriateness, in view of the rank and position of the city, of the opening address to the Church are even more obvious than in the two previous letters. "These things saith he that hath the sharp two-edged sword." The writer is uttering the words of Him who wears the symbol of absolute authority, who is intrusted with the power of life and death. This is the aspect in which he addresses himself to the official capital of the Province, the seat of authority in the ancient kingdom and in the Roman administration. To no other of the Seven Cities could this exordium have been used appropriately. To Pergamum it is entirely suitable. He that hath the absolute and universal authority speaks to the Church situated in the city where authority dwells.

The writer knows well the history of the Church in Pergamum. Its fortunes had been mainly determined by the rank and character of the city as the seat of government and authority; and He who knows its history expresses the fulness of His knowledge in the striking words, "I know where thou dwellest, where Satan's throne is." In these remarkable words is compressed a world of meaning. "Satan" is a term here employed in a figurative sense to denote the power or influence that withstands the Church and its members. The usage is similar to that seen in

1 Thessalonians ii. 18 : in *St. Paul the Traveller* it is pointed out that in that passage "Satan" probably implies the clever device whereby, without any formal decree of expulsion or banishment (which was difficult to enforce or make permanent), the Apostle was prevented from returning to Thessalonica. Similarly, in the present case, "Satan" is the official authority and power which stands in opposition to the Church.

But the situation has now developed greatly. When St. Paul was writing that letter to the Thessalonians, the civil power that hindered him was the authority of the city magistrates. The imperial administration had not at that time declared itself in opposition to the new teaching, and was in practice so conducted as to give free scope to this or any other kind of philosophic or moral or religious movement. But before the Seven Letters were written, the imperial government had already set itself definitely in opposition to the Church of Christ. The procedure against the Christians was fixed and stereotyped. Their loyalty was now tested by the one criterion recognized alike by public opinion and by government policy, viz., their willingness to perform the ritual of the State religion, and make offering to the imperial god, the divine emperor. Those who refused to comply with this requirement were forthwith condemned to death as traitors and enemies of the State.

In this State religion of the Empire, the worship of the divine Emperors, organized on a regular system in Asia as in all other Provinces, Satan found his home and exercised his power in opposition to God and His Church. Pergamum, as being still the administrative capital of the Province, was also the chief seat of the State religion. Here was built the first Asian Temple of the divine Augustus, which for more than forty years was the one centre of the Imperial religion for the whole Province. A second Asian Temple

had afterwards been built at Smyrna, and a third at Ephesus; but they were still secondary to the original Temple at Pergamum.

In this Pergamenian Temple, then, Satan was enthroned. The whole authority of the State, as arrayed against the Church, was concentrated in that Temple. The history of the Church in Pergamum had been determined by its close proximity to the seat of State opposition, "where Satan's throne is."

Such, beyond all doubt, was the chief determining fact in prompting this remarkable expression. But it is probable that other thoughts in a secondary degree influenced the language here. The breadth of meaning in these letters is so great, that one suggestion is rarely sufficient; the language was prompted by the whole complex situation. In many cases we cannot hope to do more than describe some one side of the situation, which happens to be best known to us; but here we can see that the form of the expression was clearly determined in some degree by the historical associations and the natural features of the city. Pergamum had for centuries been the royal city first of the Attalid kings and afterwards of the viceroy who represented the Emperor in the Province. History marked it out as the royal city, and not less clearly has nature done so. No city of the whole of Asia Minor—so far as I have seen, and there are few of any importance which I have not seen—possesses the same imposing and dominating aspect. It is the one city of the land which forced from me the exclamation "a royal city!" I came to it after seeing the others, and that was the impression which I derived. There is something unique and overpowering in its effect, planted as it is on its magnificent hill, standing out boldly in the level plain, and dominating the valley and the mountains on the south. Other cities of the land have splendid hills which made them into powerful fortresses in ancient time; but in

them the hill is as a rule the acropolis, and the city lies beneath and around or before it. But here the hill was the city proper, and the great buildings, chiefly Roman, which lie below the city, were external ornaments, lending additional beauty and stateliness to it. It is not easy to analyse fully the influences which produce that impression of regal dignity; but these considerations partly explain it. In this case, again, the natural features of the city give a fuller meaning to the words of the letter.

Some confusion is caused by the peculiar relation between Ephesus (which we have previously styled the capital of the Province) and Pergamum. Each of the two was in a sense the metropolis of Asia. It is impossible, in the dearth of information, to define the limits of their circles of influence; and it was, in all probability, hardly possible to do so very exactly at the time when the Seven Letters were written. Pergamum was the historical capital, originally the one metropolis of Asia, and still the official capital. But Pergamum was badly situated for commerce and communication; it did not lie on any of the great natural lines of trade between Rome and the East (though it was situated on the Imperial Post-road to the East, as that route was organized by Augustus and lasted throughout the first century); and therefore it could not permanently maintain its premier rank in the Province. The sea-ends of the two great roads across Asia Minor were at Ephesus and Smyrna; one or other of those two cities must inevitably become the capital of the Roman Province; and circumstances had for the moment determined in favour of Ephesus. Smyrna, indeed, offered the better harbour, more accessible for ships, at the head of a gulf extending far up into the land, bringing sea-borne trade nearer the heart of the country; it had permanent vitality as the chief city of Asia; and the future was with it. But Ephesus commanded the most important land route; and this gave it a temporary advantage, though

the changing nature of its situation denied it permanent possession of the honour.

The Christian Church and its leaders had from the first seized on Ephesus as the centre of the Asian congregations, whether through a certain unerring instinct for the true value of natural facts, or because they were driven on in that direction by circumstances—but are not these merely two different aspects of one fact? Pergamum, however, and even Smyrna, had also a certain claim to the primacy of Asia; and it is interesting to observe how all these varied claims and characteristics are mirrored and expressed in these letters. To the unobservant eye Pergamum was, apparently, even yet the capital of the Province; Hadrian was probably the first Emperor to recognize formally the primacy of Ephesus over all Asia; and this was marked in the silver coinage which he struck for the Province, on which Artemis of Ephesus was named officially as the goddess who presided over the whole Province, and was regarded as sharing with the divine Emperors the presidency and guardianship of Asia. Already in the time of St. Paul the Ephesians had claimed that position for their goddess (Acts xix. 27), and in an inscription of Acmonia in Phrygia, dated A.D. 94, that position and honour for the Ephesian goddess is mentioned as an accepted fact;[1] but Hadrian probably was the first to grant official Roman recognition, making the worship of the goddess part of the State religion of the Province. Considering the close connexion in ancient times between religion, political organization, and the sentiment of patriotism, we must conclude that this wider acceptance of Ephesian religion over the whole of Asia, beginning from non-official action, and finally made official and imperial, marked and implied the rise of Ephesus to the primacy of the Province; but, at the time when the

[1] This inscription is published in an article *Deux Jours en Phrygie* in the *Revue des Études Anciennes.*

Seven Letters were written, the popular recognition of the goddess in the Asian cities had not been confirmed by Imperial act.

As being close to the enemy's centre, Pergamum had been most exposed to danger from State persecution. Here, for the first time in the Seven Letters, this topic comes up. The suffering which had characterized the lot of Smyrna proceeded chiefly from their fellow-citizens, and, above all, from the Jews; but the persecution that fell to the lot of Pergamum is clearly distinguished from that kind of suffering. In Pergamum it took the form of suffering for the Name, when Christians were tried in the proconsular court and confronted with the alternative of conforming to the State religion or immediate sentence of death. Naturally, that kind of persecution originated from Pergamum, and had there its centre. Prisoners were carried from all parts of the Province to Pergamum for trial and sentence before the one authority who possessed the right of the sword, *jus gladii*, the power of life and death, viz. the Roman Proconsul of Asia.

Two errors must here be guarded against. "Antipas, my witness, who was killed among you," is the only sufferer mentioned. But it would be utterly erroneous to infer (as some have done) that Antipas had been the only Christian executed as yet in Pergamum or in the Province. His name is mentioned and preserved only as the first in the already long series: the subsequent chapters of the Revelation, which tell of the woman drunk with the blood of the saints, show what were the real facts.

In the second place, it would be equally erroneous to argue that only members of the Church of Pergamum had as yet suffered death. It is not even certain that Antipas was a member of that congregation: the words are not inconsistent with the possibility that Antipas was brought up for trial from some other city, and "killed among the Perga-

menians." A wide-spread persecution had already occurred, and the processes of law had been fully developed in it. The Apocalypse places us in view of a procedure developed far beyond that which Tacitus describes as ruling in the reign of Nero; and such a formed and stereotyped procedure was elaborated only through the practice and precedents established during later persecution.

The honourable history and the steadfast loyalty of the Pergamenian Church, however, had been tarnished by the error of a small part of the congregation, which had been convinced by the teaching of the Nicolaitans. This school of thought and conduct played an important part in the Church of the first century. Ephesus had tried and rejected it; the Smyrnaean congregation, despised and ill-treated by their fellow-citizens, had not apparently been tempted or affected by it; in Pergamum a minority of the Church had adopted its principles; in Thyatira the majority were attracted by it, and it there found its chief seat, so far as Asia was concerned. Probably the controversy with regard to the Nicolaitan views was fought out and determined in Asia more decisively than in any other Province, though the same questions must have presented themselves and demanded an answer in every Province and city where the Graeco-Roman civilization was established. The character of this movement, obscure and almost unknown to us, because the questions which it raised were determined at so early a date, will be most conveniently treated under Thyatira; but it is necessary here to point out that it was evidently an attempt to effect a reasonable compromise with the established usages of Graeco-Roman society and to retain as many as possible of those usages in the Christian system of life. It affected most of all the educated and cultured classes in the Church, those who had most temptation to retain as much as possible of the established social order and customs of the Graeco-Roman

world, and who by their more elaborate education had been most fitted to take a somewhat artificial view of life and to reconcile contradictory principles in practical conduct through subtle philosophical reasoning.

The historian who looks back over the past will find it impossible to condemn the Nicolaitan principles in so violent and even bigoted fashion as St. John condemned them. But the Apostle, while writing the Seven Letters, was not concerned to investigate all sides of the case, and to estimate with careful precision exactly how much could be reasonably argued on behalf of the Nicolaitans. He saw that they had gone wrong on the essential and critical alternative; and he cared for nothing more. To him, in the absorbing interest of practical life, no nice weighing of comparative right was possible; he divided all Christians into two categories, those who were right and those who were wrong. Those who were wrong he hated with his whole heart and soul; and he almost loved the Ephesians, as we have seen, because they also hated the Nicolaitans; they were to him almost worse than the open and declared enemies on the pagan side; and he would probably have entirely denied them the name of Christians.

But the historian must regard the Nicolaitans with intense interest, and must regret deeply that we know so little about them, and that only from their enemies. And yet at the same time he must feel that nothing could have saved the infant Church from melting away into one of those vague and ineffective schools of philosophic ethics except the stern and strict rule that is laid down here by St. John. An easy-going Christianity could never have survived; it could not have conquered and trained the world; only the most convinced, resolute, almost bigoted adherence to the most uncompromising interpretation of its own principles could have given the Christians the courage and self-reliance that were needed.

Especially, it is highly probable that the Nicolaitans either already had or soon would have reached the conclusion that they might justifiably comply with the current test of loyalty, and burn a little incense in honour of the Emperor. The Church was not disloyal; its most fanatical defenders claimed to be loyal; then why make any difficulty about burning a few grains of incense? A little incense was nothing; an excellent and convincing argument can readily be worked out; and then—the whole ritual of the State religion would have followed as a matter of course; Christ and Augustus would bave been enthroned side by side as they were in the compromise attempted by the Emperor Alexander Severus more than a century later; and everything that was vital in Christianity would have been lost. St. John, like St. Paul in 1 Corinthians, saw the real issue that lay before the Church—it must conquer and destroy the Imperial Antichrist, or it must compromise with Antichrist, and in so doing be itself destroyed. Both St. Paul and St. John answered with the most hearty and unwavering, uncompromising decisiveness. Not the faintest shadow of acquiescence in idolatry must be permitted to the Christian. On this the Nicolaitans, with all good intention, went wrong; and to St. John the error was unpardonable. He compares the Nicolaitans to the Israelites who were led astray into pleasure and vice by the subtle plan of Balaam. No words of condemnation are too strong for him to use. Their teaching was earthly, sensual, devilish. In their philosophical refinements of argumentation he saw only "the deep things of Satan."

It is clear also that the Nicolaitans rather pitied and contemned the humbler intelligence and humbler position of the opposite section in the Church; and hence we shall find that both in the Thyatiran and in the Pergamenian letter St. John exalts the dignity, authority and power

that shall fall to the lot of the victorious Christian. Christ can and will give His true followers far more than the Nicolaitans promise. No power or rank in the world equals the lofty position that Christ will give; the imperial dignity and name of Augustus cannot be compared with the dignity and name of the glorified Christ which He will give to His own.

Further light is, as usual, thrown on the opening address of the letter by the promise at the end: "To him that overcometh will I give of the hidden manna, and I will give him a white stone, and upon the stone a new name written, which no one knoweth but he that receiveth it."

An explanation of the white pebble or tessera with the New Name has been sought in many different objects used in ancient times, or ideas current among ancient peoples, Greek, Roman, and Jewish. Some scholars quote the analogy of the tessera given to proved and successful gladiators inscribed with the new title *spectatus*;[1] but this analogy, though tempting in some ways, unfortunately depends on an antiquated interpretation. The letters on the gladiatorial *tesserae* have been proved to stand, not for *spectatus*, but for *spectabat*.[1] No new name was given to the proved gladiator with the tessera: he was simply allowed to retire into private life after a proved and successful career, instead of being compelled to risk his reputation and life when his powers were failing. The analogy fails in the most essential points. Still more unsatisfactory is the comparison with the voting ballot used by jurors or political voters, the tessera that served as an entrance-ticket to distributions,

[1] The writer has been obliged to write this article on a journey across Europe, with no books at hand except Dieterich's *Mithrasliturgie*, Mr. Anderson Scott's edition in the *Century* Bible, and Alford's edition of the Greek Text, and must apologize for any defects or inaccuracies which may find their way into the article, only a small part of which has been seen in proof by the writer. It is unnecessary here to discuss the curious technical or slang use of *spectabat* as a neuter verb.

banquets, or other public occasions, and so on through all the various purposes served by such tesserae or stones. All are unsatisfactory and elusive; they do not make the reader feel that he has gained a clear and definite impression of the white pebble.

Yet, while none of these analogies is complete or satisfactory in itself, perhaps none is entirely wrong. The truth is that the white pebble with the New Name was not an exact reproduction of any custom or thing in the social usage of the time. It was a new conception, devised for this new purpose; but it was only a working up into a new form of familiar things and customs, and it was therefore completely intelligible to every reader in the Asian Churches. It had analogies with many things, though it was not an exact reproduction of any of them. Probably the fact is that the pebble in this letter has little special force in itself: it is simply an instrument to bear the Name, and all the stress of the passage is laid on the Name which is thus communicated.

The "white stone" was, doubtless, a tessera. It ought, strictly speaking, to be translated by that term, but *tessera* is not English and therefore unsuitable. There is no English word which gives an adequate rendering, for the thing is not used among us, and therefore we have no name for it. It was a little cube or rectangular block of bone, ivory or other substance, with words or symbols engraved on one or more faces. Such tesserae were used for a great variety of purposes. Here it is a sort of coupon or ticket bearing the name, but it is not to be given up: it is to remain secret, not to be shown to others, but to remain as the private possession of the owner.

Two facts, however, are to be noticed with regard to this "white pebble." In the first place, it is lasting and imperishable. Hence, such a translation as 'ticket' or 'coupon would—apart from the modern associations—be

entirely unsuitable, a 'ticket' is for a temporary purpose; this pebble is eternal. Already in the first of these studies, and elsewhere, the present writer has described the close relation which according to the ancient view existed between permanent validity and record on some lasting imperishable material. The mere expression in writing of any idea or word or right or title gave it a new kind of existence and an added effectiveness, placed it in short on a higher plane in the universe. But this new existence was, of course, dependent on the permanence of the writing, i.e. on the lasting nature of the material. Horace plays with the popular idea, when he declares that his lyric poetry is a *monumentum aere perennius*. The laws, the permanent foundation of right, peace, and order in a city, were written on bronze; but poetry will outlast even bronze. The New Name, then, must be written, not simply left as a sound in the air; and it must be written on an imperishable material like this pebble.

In the second place the colour is important. It was white, the fortunate colour. Suitability of the material to the subject in writing seems to have been considered to some degree in ancient time. Dr. Wünsch, one of the leading authorities, lays great stress on the fact that curses and imprecations were usually written on lead, on the ground that lead was the deadly and ill-omened metal in Greece; and as many imprecations were found at Tel-Sandahannah in the South-West of Palestine engraved on limestone, he is inclined (according to a recent number of the Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund)[1] to regard limestone as selected for a similar reason, and to contrast its dark, ill-omened hue with the "white stone"

[1] For the reason already given, I cannot quote the exact reference; I am also uncertain whether the text correctly represents Dr. Wünsch's meaning. The words in the Quarterly Statement seem rather as if he considered the "White Stone" to be similar to the limestone, suitable for bearing an adjuration to the gods of the dead.

engraved with the New Name in this case. Some doubt however is cast on this theory of material by the fact that a letter, which would not be written on a material recognized as deadly and ill-omened, has recently been found incised on a leaden tablet: it is published as the oldest Greek letter in the latest number of the Austrian *Jahreshefte*.

The allusion to the "hidden manna" is one of the few touches in the Seven Letters derived purely and exclusively from the realm of Jewish belief and superstition. It is not even taken from the Old Testament; but is a witness that some current Jewish superstitions acquired a footing in the early Christian Church. The manna laid up "before the Testimony" in the Ark was hidden in a cave of Mount Sinai, and would be revealed when Messiah came. This superstition is used as a symbol to indicate the heavenly food that should impart strength to the Christian. It is, however, quite probable that there is some special suitability in this symbol, due to popular belief current in Asia, which we have failed to catch.

Far more obscure is the allusion to the new name. We take it as clear and certain that the "new name" is the name given to the conquering Christian; and the words are suggested by the already established custom of taking a new name at baptism.

The name acquired in popular belief a close connexion with the personality, both of a human being and of a god. The true name of a god was kept secret in certain kinds of Roman religion, lest the foreigner and the enemy, by knowing the name, should be able to gain an influence over the god. The name guaranteed, and even gave, existence, reality, life: a new name implied the entrance on a new life.

This old superstition takes a peculiar form among the modern Jews of Palestine. It is their custom to change a person's name in the case of a dangerous illness, as is

mentioned by Mr. Macalister in the Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund, April, 1904, p. 153. The new name, which is retained ever afterwards, if the patient survives, frequently has reference to life,[1] or is that of some Old Testament saint whose life was specially long.

Accordingly the New Name that is given to the victorious Christian marks his entrance on a new and higher stage of existence; he has become a new person. Yet this alone would make an inadequate and unsatisfying explanation. We miss the element of power, which is imperatively demanded to suit the case of Pergamum. To furnish this element the New Name must be the name of God. Here, again, we find ourselves brought close to the sphere of popular religion, superstition and magic. Knowledge of the compelling names of God, the names of God which influence nature and the mysterious forces of the universe, was one of the chief sources of the power which both the Mysteries and the ritual of magic claimed to give their votaries. The person that had been initiated into the Mysteries learned not merely the landmarks to guide him along the road to the home of the Blessed—the white poplar and the rest—he learned also the names of God which would open the gates and bars before him, and frighten away hostile spirits or transform them into friends. Mr. Anderson Scott gives an excellent note on this passage, which may be supplemented from Dieterich's *Mithrasliturgie*, pp. 32–39. He who knows the right name of a demon or divine being can become lord over all the power that the demonic being possesses, just as he who knows the name of a man was considered to possess some power over the man, because the name partakes of reality and not merely marks his personality, but is almost identified with it.

Probably no incompatibility between these two aspects of

[1] Examples of names such as Meyer are given: also Mercarda (Spanish), i.e. bought (with prayer).

the New Name was felt by the ancient readers of this letter. The name that was written on the white stone was at once the name of the victorious Christian and the name of God. These two points of view approximated towards one another and passed into one another. Personal names frequently were derived from, or even identical with, a Divine name. The ordinary thought of ancient Greek and Anatolian religion—that the heroized dead had merely returned to the Divine Mother who bore them and become once more identified with and merged in the divine nature—also helped to obliterate the difference which we in modern times feel between the two points of view. Here and in the Philadelphian letter the name of God is also the name of the victorious Christian, written on his forehead in the latter case, given him on a white tessera in the Pergamenian letter. Pergamum and Philadelphia are the two Churches which are praised because they "held fast my name," and "did not deny it"; and they are rewarded with the New Name, at once the Name of God and their own, an eternal possession, known to the bearers only, the symbol and instrument of wider power; they shall not merely be "Christians," the people of Christ; they shall be the people of His new personality as He is hereafter revealed in glory, bearing that New Name of His glorious revelation.

As to the spirit in which popular beliefs are here used, Mr. Anderson Scott in the note just quoted has said all that there is to say. Repeatedly in the Seven Letters the same form of expression occurs, which is to be understood as contrasting the ordinary popular custom with the better form in which that custom is offered to the true Christian. To the victorious Christian shall be given the possession of a far more powerful and efficacious name than any which he could learn about in the various kinds of popular ritual, a name which will transform his whole nature and recreate him in a new character.

The promises and the principles of Christianity had to be made intelligible to minds habituated to think in the customary forms of ancient popular thought; and they are therefore expressed in the Apocalypse according to the popular forms, but these forms must be understood as merely figurative, as mere attempts, necessarily imperfect, to reach and teach the popular mind. The words and thoughts in the Seven Letters, when taken singly and separately, are to a remarkable extent such as a pagan mystic of the second century might have used; and we shall probably find that soon some champion will appear to prove that the Seven Letters took their origin from no mere Christian, but from a pagan mystic circle tinged with semi-Gnostic developments of Christianity. The same view has already been advocated by influential scholars with regard to the epitaph of the Phrygian bishop, Avircius Marcellus—with equal unreason in both cases (unless perhaps the Seven Letters present a more startlingly pagan resemblance in many points than the bishop's epitaph). Those who advocate such theories fail to catch the spirit which lies in the Christian document as a whole. The whole, as Aristotle says, is more than the sum of the material parts: there is the soul, the life, the spirit that gives vitality and unity to the parts. To miss that character in such a document is to miss what makes it Christian. To miss that is to miss everything. All those mystic rites and popular cults were far from being mere imposture or delusion; they had many elements of truth and beauty; they were all trying to reach the same result as Christianity, to satisfy the wants of the popular mind, to guide it right in its groping after God. They all used many of the same facts and rites, insisted on many similar customs and methods, employed often the same words and symbols as Christianity used; and yet the result is so utterly different in character and spirit that one would have been inclined to say that not even a

single paragraph or sentence of the Christian document could have been mistaken for a product of one of those Mystic circles of devotees, had it not been for the treatment that the testament of Avircius Marcellus has recently received from some high authorities—discussed point by point, detail after detail, without regard to the spirit of the whole, and thus proved to be non-Christian by ignoring all that is Christian in it.

There is, however, a certain obscurity, which must evidently be intentional, in this passage; more is meant than lies on the surface. Now the earlier part of the letter is characterized by an unmistakable and yet carefully veiled opposition to the State religion and to the government which had provoked that opposition; and this quality in the letter guides us to the proper understanding of the conclusion, which is one of the most remarkable passages in the Seven Letters. The readers of this letter, who possessed the key to its comprehension, hidden from the common world, could not fail to be struck with the analogy between this New Name and the imperial title Augustus. That also had been a new name, deliberately devised by the Senate to designate the founder, and to mark the foundation of the new Empire: it was an old sacred word,[1] used previously only in the language of the priests, and never applied to any human being. It was now appropriated to the one man who had been the saviour of Rome, and whom already the popular belief had begun to regard as an incarnation of the divine nature in human form, sent down to earth to end the period of war and introduce the age of peace. This sacred, divine name, marked out the man to whom it was applied as one apart from the world, standing on a higher level, possessor of superhuman power in virtue of this new name and transmitting that power through the name to his descendants.

[1] "Sancta vocant *augusta* patres," Ovid, *Fast.* i.

The analogy was striking; and the points of difference were only to the advantage of the Christian. His new name was secret, but all the more efficacious on that account. The readers for whom this letter was written—the Christians of Pergamum, of all Asia, of the whole world—would catch with certainty the hidden meaning. They were to be placed in the same position as, or rather higher than, Augustus, when they were victorious, with a New Name, the Name of God, their own secret possession, which no man would know and therefore no man could tamper with by acquiring control through knowledge. As Augustus had been set above the Roman world by his new name, so they would be set above the world by theirs.

This is the answer which the Church made to the persecuting Emperor, who beyond all his predecessors prided himself on his divine nature and his divine name. To insult, proscription, a shameful death, it returns a triumphant defiance: the Emperor is powerless: the supreme power and authority remain with the victorious Christian, who defeats the Emperor by virtue of the death which the Emperor inflicts. Here for the first time in the Seven Letters the absolute and inexorable opposition between the Church and the imperial government is clearly expressed. It is not merely that the State persecutes the Church. The Church proscribes and sets itself above the Augustan government and the Augusti themselves. And this is done in the letter to the Church in that city where the imperial government with the imperial religion had placed its capital and its throne.

The taking of a new name and the meaning attached to this in the usage of the time was illustrated from the case of Aelius Aristides, the famous orator of Hadrianoi and Smyrna, by the late Dr. Hort. I am informed by a correspondent, whose name, for the reason already stated, I cannot at present mention with the gratitude which I feel,

that Dr. Hort in his lectures stated that Aristides tells his readers how in a vision he received from the god a white stone with his new name inscribed on it. My informant had not heard the lecture personally; but only received a report of it verbally from an auditor. I suspect that some slight inaccuracy has crept into the report, and that insensibly the facts regarding the new name of Aristides have been tinged by heightened resemblance to the words of this letter. It may however be taken as certain that whatever Dr. Hort actually said was exactly correct; and if he used the illustration precisely as reported, then some passage of Aristides unknown to me lay before him as he spoke. Dr. Hort was one of the few scholars who could not be inaccurate in any detail however slight. The facts, however, as known to me from various passages of Aristides, chiefly in the Lalia (Hymn) to Aesculapius and in the Sacred Discourses, come very near justifying the report of Dr. Hort's lecture.

The case of Aristides, who was born probably in 117 A.D., may be taken as applicable to the period of the Apocalypse. Aristides had a new name, given him by the god, especially Aesculapius, his chief protector and adviser and helper, though the mother of the god also regarded him as her *protégé* and favourite. Aesculapius cured him of his disease, guided him in his life by ordering him to devote himself to oratory, revealed himself to his favoured servant, and gave him the name Theodorus.[1] There is much probability that the name was given in a way not dissimilar to that described in the Pergamenian letter, though the evidence is not quite clear.

There is a remarkable passage at the end of Aristides's Hymn to Aesculapius, which Reiske declares himself unable to understand, though he suggests that it refers to some prophecy vouchsafed to Aristides by Aesculapius in a dream.

[1] See Aristides, vol. i., pp. 505, 518, 522 (Dindorf).

Words which Reiske could not understand must be very obscure; and hence the passage has attracted little attention.

It is rather bold to offer an explanation where that excellent scholar says "*non intelligo*"; but the words of Aristides seem to illustrate the passage before us so well, that an interpretation may be offered. The words and the situation are as follows. Aristides has just related how through the aid and orders of Aesculapius he had appeared in Rome and given a successful display of oratory before the two Emperors, before the ladies of the Imperial family and the whole Imperial court, just as Ulysses had been enabled by Athena to display his eloquence in the hall of Alcinous before the Phaeacian audience. "And not only were these things carried out in this way, but also the Symbol or Synthêma was with me encouraging me, as you showed in fact that there were many reasons why you brought me before the public as a speaker,—that I might be conspicuous in oratory, and that the most perfect (the highest circles and educated persons) might hear with their own ears the better things (i.e. the teaching of a true philosophy and morality)."[1]

The nature of the *σύνθημα* which Aristides received from the god he does not explain. The obscurity in which he leaves it is obviously intentional. It was a secret between the god and himself; he had been, and he alone, initiated by the god into this ministry, and it was not to be published for every one to know. Only they should understand who might be initiated into the same mystery: the word and the sign would be enough for them: others who were outside should remain ignorant.

But Aristides adds one word which gives a hint as to the purpose and effect of the Synthêma: the Synthêma was

[1] Καὶ ταῦτα τε οὕτως ἐπέπρακτο καὶ τὸ σύνθημα παρῆν ἀνακαλοῦν, ἔργῳ σου δείξαντος ὅτι πολλῶν ἕνεκα προήγαγες εἰς μέσον ὡς φανείημεν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις, καὶ γένοιντο αὐτήκοοι τῶν κρειττόνων οἱ τελεώτατοι.

something ἀνακαλοῦν, something that addressed him with earnest, rousing voice, a practical sign and proof that the god for various reasons brought him before the assembled world in order that he should gain distinction as an orator and that the noblest should hear with their own ears good counsel on good subjects.

The Synthêma then was a symbol always with him which spoke direct to him; it was a pledge of success from the god who gave it, and thus filled him with god-given confidence. Hence it served for a call to action as an orator; for it recalled the orders and assurances and promises that the god had given him in the past, and was a pledge that there still subsisted between the god and his votary that same bond of connexion and mutual confidence.

In a way not unlike this, the term Synthemata was used to indicate the signs or words of a symbolic code, which two persons arranged with one another in order that their letters might convey more meaning to the intended recipient than to any chance reader who was not aware of the secret.

It is to be observed that, though Aristides regarded Aesculapius as his special protector and guide in life, the name which was given him was not Asclepiodoros, but Theodoros. The "gift of god" (and not "the gift of Aesculapius") was doubtless the Synthêma that was always with him, whether inscribed on a stone or in some other form. This new name, given him by the god, was an encouragement to effort, and a pledge of success. Aesculapius, who gave him the name (probably, as Reiske thought, in a dream), was merely the form in which the ultimate divine power envisaged itself to Aristides; but it was "the god," and not Aesculapius, whose name he bore.

Orators of that period seem commonly to have regarded themselves as sent by divine mission, and as charged with a message of divine truth. So Dion Chrysostom several times claims divine mission; and in one of his speeches at

Tarsus he explains that all that happens to us in an unexpected, unintended, self-originated way, ought to be regarded by us as sent to us by the god, and therefore, as he has appeared in such a way before the Tarsian audience, they should regard him as speaking with authority as the divine messenger.[1] The speech was delivered probably in the third period of Dion's career, which began when he received news of the death of Domitian, and thus his case illustrates strictly contemporary belief about those travelling orators and teachers, who in many ways show so close analogy to the Christian Apostles and travelling preachers.

W. M. Ramsay.

THE DEATH OF JUDAS.

The two brief accounts, seemingly independent of each other, given in St. Matthew's Gospel (xxvii. 3–10), and in the Acts (i. 18, 19) respectively, of the fate which overtook Judas are not easy to reconcile, and offer a brief study of them to the readers of the Expositor.

The earliest extant account, i.e. St. Mark's (followed also by St. Luke), of the bargain made with Judas simply says that the chief priests "promised to give him money" (Mark xiv. 11; Luke xxii. 5). Nothing is told in this narrative either of the amount of the bribe, or of the way in which it was ultimately expended, or of the fate of the traitor. The writer of the First Gospel has a good deal to tell on these points. He says that the price paid was "thirty pieces of silver" (Matt. xxvi. 15), and it is to be noted that he uses here the words of Zechariah xi. 12, *ἔστησαν τριάκοντα ἀργύρια*. He tells also that Judas, driven by remorse, brought the money back to the priests, and that

[1] I quote from memory, and must apologize for possible inaccuracy in the quotation.

he then went away and hanged himself (*ἀπελθὼν ἀπήγξατο*, Matt. xxvii. 5). The priests, regarding the money as the price of blood, would not put it into the treasury, but bought therewith the Potter's Field (*τὸν Ἀγρὸν τοῦ Κεραμέως*) "to bury strangers in: therefore that field was called the Field of Blood (*Ἀγρὸς Αἵματος*) until this day. Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremiah the prophet, saying, etc."

Upon this we first observe that the author of the First Gospel is particularly prone to quote the Old Testament: he finds prophetical prevision of the Christ more frequently than any other Evangelist.

Next, he does not quote here with accuracy from any texts now known to us. The prophecy cited is not from Jeremiah, but (apparently) from Zechariah; and further, the passage is quoted in a form which does not agree either with the Hebrew or the LXX of Zechariah, as will be seen by a comparison. Whether he is actuated by a desire to harmonize the prophecy and the narrative, must be considered.

The Revised Version of Zechariah xi. 12, 13, following the Masoretic text, gives:—

"So they weighed for my hire thirty pieces of silver. And the Lord said unto me, Cast it unto the potter, the goodly price that I was prized at of them. And I took the thirty pieces of silver, and cast them unto the potter, in the house of the Lord."

The LXX has:—

Καὶ ἔστησαν τὸν μισθόν μου τριάκοντα ἀργυροῦς. καὶ εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς μέ, Κάθες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ χωνευτήριον καὶ σκέψομαι εἰ δόκιμόν ἐστιν, ὃν τρόπον ἐδοκιμάσθη ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. καὶ ἔλαβον τοὺς τριάκοντα ἀργυροῦς καὶ ἐνέβαλον αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν οἶκον κυρίου εἰς τὸ χωνευτήριον.

This the Evangelist quotes in the form:—

Καὶ ἔλαβον τὰ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια, τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ τετιμημένου

ὃν ἐτιμήσαντο ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ, καὶ ἔδωκαν (v.l. ἔδωκα) αὐτὰ εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν τοῦ κεραμέως, καθὰ συνέταξέν μοι κύριος.

If the context of the Zechariah passage be read, it will be seen that certain shepherds having neglected the unhappy "flock of slaughter," the prophet "fed" them for a time in obedience to the command of Jehovah. Wearying of them, he ceased from his work, breaking his staff Beauty, the token of the covenant between him and the people. "And I said unto them, If ye think good, give me my hire; and if not, forbear. So they weighed for my hire thirty pieces of silver," etc., as quoted above from the R.V. There is, then, no apparent parallel as to character or conduct between the recipient of the thirty silver pieces in Zechariah and Judas, for the prophet was no traitor, but had earned his reward by the faithful discharge of duty. Next, we notice that the meaning of casting the money "unto the potter" (according to the Masoretic text) is to indicate how contemptible a sum it was, the money-value of a slave (Exod. xxi. 32). The Syriac version puts a different complexion on the action by rendering "into the treasury" instead of "unto the potter"; that is, according to the Syriac, the money paid as hire to the prophet was treated as Jehovah's due: it was not put to his own uses by Zechariah, but paid "into the treasury." Yet another turn is given to this perplexing piece of symbolism by the LXX. As is shown by the Greek cited above, the LXX understood the motive of casting the money to the potter to be that the silver might be tested, to ascertain whether it were good or base coin. But neither in Hebrew nor Syriac nor LXX is there any mention of a "potter's *field*," or of the purchase of one; nor is there anything which would naturally suggest such a thing, either in the Zechariah passage or in the chapters of Jeremiah (xviii., xix.) which speak of a "potter." Thus we arrive, at any rate, at one certain conclusion, viz.: that the purchase of the

potter's field recorded in the First Gospel is not evolved by the writer's imagination out of the Zechariah passage. He must have been working on a tradition which, quite independently, connected Judas and a "Potter's Field." And there is another inference which we may draw, though not with the same certainty. Freely as the writer of Matthew xxvii. 9 has dealt with the original in the quotation which he makes, and although it is quite clear from Matthew xxvi. 15 that he has the Zechariah passage in his mind all through, he can hardly be accused of having rehandled his prophetical text in the interests of his narrative. For he leaves out the special point in the episode in Zechariah to which his narrative presents the most striking parallel. He omits to quote the words *εἰς τὸν οἶκον κυρίου* which describe the situation of the *χωνευτήριον* of the LXX, into which the money was cast. Yet of Judas he had written (*v.* 5), *ῥίψας τὰ ἀργύρια εἰς τὸν ναόν*. The Evangelist's omission of Old Testament words, which would serve well as a prefigurement of this point, is, on any hypothesis, remarkable.

We may say, then, of St. Matthew's narrative, that it rests upon a tradition *independent of the prophecy cited;* the applicability of which is, in truth, by no means apparent. And the salient features of the tradition were these: (*a*) Judas, stricken by remorse, returned the money paid him; (*b*) He hanged himself in despair; (*c*) the priests with the money bought a field called the "Potter's Field," which thenceforth was called *Ἀγρὸς Αἵματος*; (*d*) The field was used as a cemetery for foreigners.

Let us now take up St. Luke's account in the Acts. It runs as follows:

Οὗτος μὲν οὖν ἐκτήσατο χωρίον ἐκ μισθοῦ τῆς ἀδικίας, καὶ πρηνὴς γενόμενος, ἐλάκησεν μέσος, καὶ ἐξεχύθη πάντα τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ. καὶ γνωστὸν ἐγένετο πᾶσι τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν

Ἰερουσαλήμ, ὥστε κληθῆναι τὸ χωρίον ἐκεῖνο τῇ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν Ἀκελδαμάχ, τοῦτ' ἔστιν Χωρίον Αἵματος (Acts i. 18, 19).

There are marked differences between this and St. Matthew's narrative.

(*a*) Nothing is said of Judas' remorse, nor is he represented as returning the money. (*b*) His death is not self-inflicted, nor was it caused by hanging; it is described as due to a fall and a consequent rupture of the abdomen. (*c*) He himself is said to have bought a field with his wages, whereas St. Matthew tells that it was bought by the priests. (*d*) Nothing is said by St. Luke of the purpose for which the field was used after the death of Judas. (*e*) St. Luke knows nothing of its having been a "Potter's Field." (*f*) According to St. Matthew, the "blood," which gave its name to the field, was the blood of Christ shed through Judas' treachery; according to St. Luke, it was the blood of Judas by which the field was defiled.

The only point common to the two accounts is that the name by which the field was known in the next generation was an Aramaic word which was variously translated Ἀγρὸς Αἵματος and Χωρίον Αἵματος by St. Matthew and St. Luke. St. Luke gives a transliteration of this Aramaic name; he says it was Ἀκελδαμάχ, that is, he understands it as חֲקַל דְּמָא, "a Field of Blood." Ἀκελδαμάχ, is, no doubt, a possible transliteration of this Hebrew, for we have other instances of final א being represented by the Greek χ; as, e.g., in the equation Σιράχ = סִירָא. But we should certainly not *expect* a final χ, although it might be defended, if the last part of the Aramaic title were דְּמָא; the presence of χ suggests rather that the Aramaic title ended with the letters דמך. Now it is remarkable that דְּמַךְ = κοιμᾶσθαι, so that κοιμητήριον, "cemetery," would be the exact equivalent of חֲקַל דְּמַךְ. And Klostermann has suggested that this was really the name by which the field

was known to the native Jews, and that we have here a corroboration of St. Matthew's tradition that it was used "to bury strangers in" (Matt. xxvii. 7). We have, then, to suppose that the name became corrupted in popular speech into חֲקַל דְּמָא, and that at the time when the Acts and the First Gospel were written, it was generally pronounced in the latter way. This would be like the corruption of (say) "Bodyfield" into "Bloodyfield" in English, and is a possible transformation. Whether it took place or not, however, the concurrence of the two independent accounts leaves us in no doubt that a field, commonly called the "Field of Blood," was associated in the popular mind with Judas and his hire; and there is no reason for refusing to accept St. Matthew's statements that it had been formerly used for a potter's field or pit, and was, at the time when he wrote, used as a burial place for foreigners. These are points as to which tradition was little likely to be mistaken, and—as we have seen—there is nothing in the prophecy quoted by St. Matthew which could have suggested them.

We now turn to the points of divergence between St. Matthew's narrative and the Acts, and they compel us to regard the two writers as following independent traditions. The efforts that have been made to bring them into correspondence are but futile. The Vulgate boldly combines the narratives by reading *suspensus crepuit* in Acts i. 18, and an older Latin version quoted by Augustine had *et collum sibi alligavit et deiectus in faciem disruptus est medius.*[1] But this is to alter the text in the interests of the harmonizer. It has been supposed as in the Vulgate that Judas having hanged himself, his body fell to the ground by the breaking of the rope, or that he did not succeed in his attempt at suicide but died of a fall afterwards. But these hypotheses are only expedients adopted to evade the plain divergence

[1] Blass actually inserts καὶ κατέδησεν αὑτοῦ τὸν τράχηλον in the Roman text of Acts i. 18, relying on this passage from Augustine.

of the narratives. The one fact which we may regard as established by both accounts of Judas' death is that it took place within a few days after his treachery. It is just as clear in Acts i. as if it were explicitly stated that Judas was dead when St. Peter addressed the assembled disciples with the view of electing a successor to him in the Apostolate. Consequently the hypothesis of a *lingering* death due to a disease like dropsy or elephantiasis may be set aside. Nevertheless, such an hypothesis, however improbable it may seem, had wide currency in the early Church, and it was based on a statement of Papias. Papias, whose words have come down to us in various forms, says that Judas swelled up to an enormous size, and that his death was caused (according to one version) by a fall, or (according to another) by a passing waggon.[1] He says nothing of suicide. It is probable that Papias read *πρησθείς*, "swelled up" (a reading which is found in the Armenian Catena on the Acts), for *πρηνής* in Acts i. 18; but it is entirely unlikely that this was the original reading. Papias' story, which enters into gruesome and repulsive details, has several parallels in folk-lore literature;[2] one example of which is apposite to our text and must be quoted here. It occurs in the *Acta Thomae*, § 33. The legend tells that a dragon killed a young man by his bite and was compelled by the Apostle to suck the poison out of the wound, and then *ὁ δράκων φυσηθεὶς ἐλάκησε καὶ ἀπέθανε καὶ ἐξεχύθη ὁ ἰὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ χολή*. The dragon having thus burst asunder was swallowed up in a chasm which opened in the earth, and the Apostle commanded houses to be built upon the site

[1] *Πρησθεὶς γὰρ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον τὴν σάρκα, ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι διελθεῖν ἁμάξης ραδίως διερχομένης, ὑπὸ τῆς ἁμάξης πταισθέντα τὰ ἔγκατα ἐγκενωθῆναι* is the form of Papias' story as reported by Apollinaris of Laodicea in Cramer's Catena on St. Matthew.

[2] See Rendel Harris *Did Judas really commit Suicide?* in the *American Journal of Philology* for July, 1900; a highly interesting paper, with the conclusions of which, however, I do not agree.

ἵνα οἴκησις γένηται τοῖς ξένοις, "that it might be a dwelling-place for strangers." We seem to have here reminiscences of the Judas story; the rare word ἐλάκησε and the word ἐξεχύθη recalling Acts i. 18, while the last sentence about the use to which the site was put suggests Matthew xxvii. 7. But the *swelling up* of the dragon is not necessarily derived from Papias. Mr. Rendel Harris has pointed out that in folk-lore tales this was a common fate for evildoers, and it is probable that both Papias and Leucius (or whoever was the author of the *Acta Thomae*) are building on the same superstition. But all the information that Papias' story gives us as to the death of Judas is that it was regarded in his day as a natural death and not a suicide. So far Papias supports the Acts, rather than St. Matthew; but I cannot think that there is any reasonable probability that πρησθείς was the original reading for πρηνής in Acts i. 18, or that the death of Judas, which, according to both canonical accounts, took place within a few days of his treachery, was a gradual death due to a lingering disease.

One other possibility as to the narrative in the Acts should not be overlooked. The speech of Peter (Acts i. 16 ff.), and indeed the whole Lucan account of the election of Matthias, have reference both explicit and implicit to the fulfilment of prophecy, and more particularly to the fate of Judas as foreshadowed in Psalm cix. May it not then be the case that, as Strauss thought, the words of Psalm cix. 18, "It came into his inward parts like water and like oil into his bones," suggested that a dropsical swelling was the appropriate fate of Judas (cf. Num. v. 22)? This might possibly account for the Papias legend, but I cannot think that it is a sufficient explanation of Acts i. 18. For it must be repeated that St. Luke knows nothing of a lingering death or of a gradual swelling up of the body of Judas, which are indeed quite inconsistent with his narrative. There is nothing in Psalm cix. or

in Psalm lxix. which would suggest *πρηνὴς γενόμενος ἐλάκησεν μέσος καὶ ἐξεχύθη πάντα τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ.*

It appears, then, as the result of this investigation, that while the narrative of the First Gospel was composed with the idea of prophetic fulfilments in the writer's mind, and while the narrative of the Acts was overlaid in the next generation with details borrowed from folk-lore literature, we have no right to say either that Matthew xxvii. 1–9 was evolved out of Old Testament prophecies or that Acts i. 18, 19, is a mere piece of folk-lore. The two narratives have in common the death of Judas within a few days after Gethsemane and the field Aceldamach that was bought with the wages of his treachery. They differ as to whether his death was self-inflicted or not, and as to whether it were he or the priests who purchased the field. We cannot reconcile these divergences; our knowledge is insufficient for the purpose, even supposing that a reconciliation were possible. But it may be maintained—and I should myself be disposed to maintain—that the vivid and striking narrative of Matthew xxvii. 1–9 is more likely to present us with a true version of the facts than the short explanatory note (for it is no more) inserted in the middle of St. Peter's speech by the author of the Acts.

J. H. Bernard.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

In discussing the authenticity of 2 Thessalonians I must ask to be allowed to take for granted two points, both of which will probably be readily conceded.

1. That what we know as 1 Thessalonians is an authentic work of the Apostle Paul.

2. That it was written before 2 Thessalonians, and not after it, as has sometimes been held.

Nor need the external evidence on behalf of 2 Thessalonians detain us. Though not very extensive, it is sufficiently clear so far as it goes, even more so perhaps than is the case with the corresponding evidence on behalf of the First Epistle.

Thus, while we find at least possible reminiscences of its language in the Epistles of Barnabas[1] and 1 Clement,[2] and again in Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*,[3] the *Didaché* in its eschatological section shows what appear to be unmistakable signs of acquaintance with it,[4] and Dr. Lock has recently drawn attention to the interesting parallels afforded by the *Epistle Vienne and Lyons* preserved by Eusebius.[5] Apart moreover from such indirect testimonies the Epistle is definitely attributed to St. Paul by Polycarp, who quotes 2 Thess. i. 4 as the words of the "Beatus Paulus," though he wrongly thinks of them as addressed to the Philippians,[6] perhaps, as Zahn suggests,[7] because he looked upon the neighbouring Churches of Philippi and Thessalonica as forming in reality one community.

Of still greater importance is the presence of the Epistle in the Canon of the Muratorian Fragment, in Marcion's Canon, and in the Old Latin and Syriac versions.

It is unnecessary to carry the evidence further down, for there can be little or no doubt that from this time onwards the Epistle's claims to full Apostolic authority were

[1] *Barnab.* c. 15. 5; 2 Thess. ii. 8, 12.

[2] *1 Clem.* c. 38. 4; 2 Thess. i. 3, ii. 13.

[3] *Dial.* c. 32. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4, 7: c. 110. 6; 2 Thess. ii. 3 ff.

[4] *Didaché*, c. 16. 3-6; 2 Thess. ii. 3 ff. Comp. also *Did.* c. 12. 3; 2 Thess. iii. 10, 12.

[5] *Hist. Ecc.* v. 1: ἐνέσκηψεν ὁ ἀντικείμενος, προοιμιαζόμενος ἤδη τὴν μέλλουσαν ἔσεσθαι παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ . . . Χριστὸς . . . καταργῶν τὸν ἀντικείμενον . . . οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπωλείας (see Lock, Art. *Thessalonians, Second Epistle to the*, in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, iv. p. 747.

[6] Polycarp. c. 11. 3: "de vobis etenim *gloriatur in* omnibus *ecclesiis*." Compare also c. 11. 20: "Sobrii ergo estote et vos in hoc; *et non sicut inimicos tales existimetis*," with 2 Thess. iii. 15, καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐχθρὸν ἡγεῖσθε.

[7] *Geschichte des N. T. Kanons*, i. p. 815.

generally recognized in the Early Church, nor, so far as we can discover, were they ever seriously called in question until the beginning of last century.

The first to do so was Christian Schmidt (1798), who based his objections on purely internal grounds, which were assented to by de Wette in the earlier editions of his *Einleitung*, but afterwards abandoned in the fourth edition (1842), and in his Commentary on the New Testament, where the Epistle's authenticity is fully admitted.

The attack was however renewed by Kern, who was closely followed by Baur, both writers seeing in the Epistle a fictitious writing dependent on the Apocalypse, and containing features borrowed from the person and history of Nero; while Hilgenfeld went further, carrying its composition as far down as Trajan's time, a position with which in the main Bahnsen agreed.

Others in more recent times who have denied the Epistle's authenticity are Weizsäcker, Pfleiderer, Holtzmann, and Schmiedel, and in part P. Schmidt and Dr. Samuel Davidson. On the other hand, it has gained the support even of such advanced critics as Jülicher and Harnack, has been vigorously defended by Zahn, and is treated as genuine by its latest commentators in Germany, Bornemann and Wohlenberg, as well as by the general consensus of New Testament scholarship both in this country and in America.

It cannot be denied however that the authenticity of the Epistle is attended with certain difficulties, which have often led to its being used with a certain amount of hesitation in works on New Testament Theology and Pauline Eschatology,[1] and it may not therefore be out of place to subject

[1] See e.g. Dr. Charles' Jowett Lectures on *Eschatology*, p. 380 ff. 2 Thessalonians is not used at all by R. Kabisch in *Die Eschatologie des Paulus* (Göttingen, 1893) or by E. Teichmann in his useful monograph on *Die Paulinischen Vorstellungen von Auferstehung und Gericht* (Freiburg in Baden, 1896).

the principal objections that have been urged against it to a fresh examination with the view of discovering what weight is to be attached to them. For this purpose they may be conveniently considered as objections based on—

1. The Language and Style of the Epistle.
2. Its Literary Relationship to 1 Thessalonians.
3. The Character of its Doctrinal Contents.

I. Language and Style.

In itself the vocabulary of the Epistle is by no means remarkable. The words peculiar to it among New Testament writings number only 9, as compared with 23 (5 ?) in 1 Thessalonians, 33 in the Epistle to the Galatians, 41 (4 ?) in the Epistle to the Philippians, and 110 (12 ?) in 1 Corinthians. And this is the more noteworthy when we remember the unique character of some of its apocalyptic passages, and the marked tendency observable in other of the New Testament writings towards diversity of language and style in dealing with similar topics.

But while the vocabulary is thus in the main genuinely Pauline, various words and phrases are often pointed to as used in a non-Pauline manner.

Thus it is said that *κλῆσις* in 2 Thess. i. 11 (*ἵνα ὑμᾶς ἀξιώσῃ τῆς κλήσεως ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν*) refers to the final call to participation in future blessedness instead of, as is usual in St. Paul, to the initial act of the Christian's life. But even if this future reference be admitted, which is by no means certain, we have at least a partial parallel in Philippians iii. 14 (*διώκω εἰς τὸ βραβεῖον τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*), and in any case we can hardly refuse to the word a latitude of application which St. Paul might so naturally have extended to it, especially at a time when his theological system was so far from being definitely formed.

Nor again surely can any one seriously urge that because

on two occasions the Apostle used the verb ἐξελέξατο with reference to the Divine election (1 Cor. i. 27 f., Eph. i. 4), he could not therefore have used εἵλατο in 2 Thess. ii. 13 (ὅτι εἵλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς εἰς σωτηρίαν), a verb which, as we know from other evidence, he was in the habit of employing (see Phil. i. 22), and which from its special reference to the destiny or vocation of the chosen was peculiarly appropriate in the present passage.

Still more idle is the objection to ἰσχὺς in 2 Thessalonians i. 9 (ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ) for the more usual δύναμις, for not only is ἰσχὺς vouched for by Ephesians i. 19, vi. 10, but in the Thessalonian passage it is actually a quotation from Isaiah ii. 10.

And if any importance is to be attached to the solitary appearance of ἐγκαυχᾶσθαι (2 Thess. i. 4) instead of καυχᾶσθαι, which is found more than 30 times in the Pauline Epistles, or to the combination ὄλεθρος αἰώνιος (2 Thess. i. 9), which St. Paul does not again use, but which is in perfect keeping with the language of the Old Testament, and more particularly of Jesus, on which in the whole passage the writer shows himself so dependent, or to the admittedly difficult construction ὅτι ἐπιστεύθη τὸ μαρτύριον ἡμῶν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς (2 Thess. i. 10: comp. however 1 Cor. xiii. 7, 1 Tim. iii. 16, and see Winer-Moulton, p. 326)—do not these and similar anomalies tell at least as much for as against Pauline authorship, for is it likely that any imitator would have endangered the credibility of his work by making use of them?

The same might be said of the variation that appears in certain familiar formulas or phrases between our Epistle and 1 Thessalonians, even if other explanations for the changes were not forthcoming.

Thus in the opening thanksgiving, where we find instead of the simple εὐχαριστοῦμεν of 1 Thessalonians i. 2 εὐχαριστεῖν

ὀφείλομεν in 2 Thessalonians i. 3 and again in ii. 13, this may be due simply to emphasis, and is in entire accord with the more formal style of the whole Second Epistle, to which reference will have to be made again. While in the closing invocation the substitution of ὁ κύριος τῆς εἰρήνης (2 Thess. iii. 16) for ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης (1 Thess. v. 23), taken along with the similar preference of κύριος for θεὸς in other passages of the Epistle (comp. 2 Thess. ii. 13 and 1 Thess. i. 4, 2 Thess. iii. 3 and 1 Thess. v. 24, 2 Thess. iii. 5 and 1 Thess. iii. 11), may well be due to the prominent place which the exalted Lord is occupying at the moment in St. Paul's thoughts in view of His glorious Return. In any case it seems evident that throughout this Epistle ὁ κύριος is to be referred to Christ and not to God, so that there is at least no exception here to the general Pauline practice of confining the use of ὁ κύριος for God to citations from the Old Testament.

Other examples of so-called inconsistencies with the language of the first Epistle hardly need to be mentioned, such as the addition of ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in the opening salutation (2 Thess. i. 2, comp. 1 Thess. i. 1), or the substitution of ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (2 Thess. iii. 6) for ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ (1 Thess. iv. 1), or actually of καὶ διὰ τοῦτο (2 Thess. ii. 11) for διὰ τοῦτο (1 Thess. iii. 5) without the καί. When hostile criticism has to fall back on pedantries such as these, unless it is supported by other and stronger evidence than any we have yet discovered, that is in itself a confession of the insufficiency of its case. And it will, I think, be generally conceded that this Epistle, taken as a whole, so far as its language and style are concerned, leaves upon the mind of any unbiassed reader the impression of a genuinely Pauline work. For not only are there abundant traces of the Apostle's characteristic phraseology and manner, as has been clearly shown by Dr. Jowett and others, and the proof need not be

repeated,[1] but the whole Epistle reflects that indefinable original atmosphere which a great writer imparts to his work, and which in this instance we are accustomed to associate with the name of St. Paul.

II. Literary Dependence on 1 Thessalonians.

On the other hand, the very closeness of our Epistle's resemblance to 1 Thessalonians has been made the ground of a second objection to its authenticity. For the literary dependence between the two Epistles has been declared to be of such a character that the question comes to be not, "Could one man have written both Epistles?" but, "Is it likely that one man writing to the same people at what must have been a very short interval of time would repeat himself to so large an extent? Or, even if this is conceivable under certain circumstances, is it likely in the case of a writer so richly endowed and so fertile in thought as the Apostle Paul?"

The first to raise this difficulty pointedly was Weizsäcker,[2] and his arguments have recently been strongly emphasized by H. Holtzmann[3] and W. Wrede.[4] And the objection is at least an interesting one, for, when taken in conjunction with other peculiarities of the Epistle, it lends itself very easily to the idea of an imitator or forger, who, in order to gain credence for certain views he wished to express, encased them, so to speak, in the framework of a generally accepted Pauline Epistle. To this supposi-

[1] Jowett, *Epistles to the Thessalonians, Galatians, etc.*, 2nd Ed., i. p. 148 f.; Reuss, *Hist. of the New Testament*, ed. Houghton, p. 75 ("For every 'unpauline' expression the concordance shows ten Pauline").

[2] *Das apostolische Zeitalter*,[2] p. 249 f., Eng. Tr. i. p. 295 f. ("The fact that the genuineness of the epistle has been strenuously assailed is not surprising, but inevitable. The reason for this is found, above all, in its striking relation to the first letter," p. 295.)

[3] *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1901, p. 97 f.

[4] *Die Echtheit des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefs* (Texte und Untersuchungen, herausgegeben von v. Gebhardt und Harnack, N.F. ix. 2). Leipzig, 1903.

tion we shall have to return later, but in the meantime before expressing any opinion upon it, it is necessary to notice clearly how far the resemblances between the two Epistles really extend.

Both Epistles begin with a salutation in almost identical terms, and marked by a form of address which the Apostle does not employ again (1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1, 2).

This is followed by the customary thanksgiving, expressed again in a way found nowhere else in St. Paul, and based on practically the same grounds as regards the Thessalonians' state (1 Thess. i. 3, 4 ff; 2 Thess. i. 3, 4).

A section follows in the main peculiar in thought to the Second Epistle (i. 5–12), though exhibiting, again, many parallels of language with the First, while the transition to the great revelation of chap. ii. is marked by a form of appeal (*ἐρωτῶμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί*, ii. 1) which is found in the Pauline Epistles outside these two Epistles only in Philippians iv. 3.

The revelation referred to—the section regarding the man of lawlessness, ii. 1–12—stands so entirely by itself as regards contents, that it is frequently spoken of as constituting the *raison d'être* of the whole Epistle. But, apart from other Pauline peculiarities of language which it exhibits, it is interesting to notice in connexion with the point before us, that we find here the same reminiscences by the writer of a visit to his readers, and of what he had said when with them that we have already met in 1 Thessalonians (2 Thess. ii. 5, *οὐ μνημονεύετε ὅτι ἔτι ὢν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ταῦτα ἔλεγον ὑμῖν*: comp. 1 Thess. iii. 4, *καὶ γὰρ ὅτε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἦμεν, προελέγομεν ὑμῖν*), but which does not occur again in the Pauline Epistles.

No sooner, moreover, has the writer of the Second Epistle finished this, his main theme, than he utters a fervid thanksgiving and prayer for his readers, ii. 13, 14, after the manner of 1 Thessalonians ii. 12, 13, and in which

several of the characteristic words and phrases scattered through the First Epistle are re-echoed.

Similar resemblances may also be traced in the exhortation that follows to stand firm and to hold fast the traditions they have been taught (2 Thess. ii. 15; 1 Thess. iv. 1), and more especially in the remarkable invocation of 2 Thessalonians ii. 16, which corresponds both in form and place with 1 Thessalonians iii. 11, though there, in accordance with the usual practice, *ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν* comes before *ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς*: while the prayer, 2 Thessalonians iii. 5, *ὁ δὲ κύριος κατευθύναι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας*, may be compared with 1 Thessalonians iii. 11, *αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς . . . κατευθύναι τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμῶν*, the only other passages in the Pauline writings where the verb *κατευθύνειν* is found, though it is to be noted that it is used in different connexions in the two passages.

The closing section of 2 Thessalonians iii. 6–15, like the closing section of 1 Thessalonians v. 1 ff., is occupied with practical exhortations, which in the main follow independent lines, though we are again struck with the recurrence here of various turns of expression and thought with which the First Epistle has already made us familiar—such as the warning against *disorderly walking* (2 Thess. iii. 6, 7, 11: 1 Thess. v. 14); the call to *imitate* the writer's mode of life (2 Thess. iii. 7, 9: 1 Thess. i. 6, 7); and the reference to the Apostles' *labouring night and day* that they might not prove themselves *burdensome* to their converts (2 Thess. iii. 8: 1 Thess. ii. 9), to which the Second Epistle adds the further thought of providing an example to the restless and idle (2 Thess. iii. 9).

Both Epistles end with an invocation to "the Lord (God, 1 Thess.) of peace," and with the customary Pauline benediction (2 Thess. iii. 18: 1 Thess. v. 18).

The resemblances between the two writings are thus very striking, and justice can hardly be said to have been

done to them as a rule by the upholders of the Pauline authorship of the Second Epistle. At the same time, care must be taken that they are not pressed too far. Even our brief review has indicated what an examination of Wrede's carefully prepared Tables makes still more evident, that at most the parallelism between the two Epistles cannot be said to extend to more than one-third of their whole contents. And from this, again, there fall to be deducted such parallels as are afforded by the salutation at the beginning, the benediction at the close, the phrases of transition from one subject to another, and similar formal expressions, where a close resemblance of language is not only natural but probable.[1]

Nor must it be forgotten that even where certain sections of the Second Epistle correspond in their general contents to certain sections of the First, the actual parallelisms in language are by no means always found within these corresponding sections, but have frequently to be drawn from the two Epistles as wholes. And not only so, but they often occur in such different connexions as to suggest not so much the slavish copying by one man of another, as rather the free handling by the same writer of certain familiar words and phrases.

The same may be said of the differences of *tone*, combined with the similarities of expression between the two Epistles of which certain critics have made so much. It is quite true that in certain particulars the general tone of Second Thessalonians is more official and severe than the tone of First Thessalonians, though warm and personal passages are not wanting (e.g., i. 11, ii. 16 f.,

[1] According to Schmiedel (*Hand-Commentar zum N.T.*, II. i. 8), out of not quite 825 words in Second Thessalonians over 150 correspond literally, and over 30, with slight variations, with the vocabulary of First Thessalonians: not surely a very large number when the circumstances of the Epistle's composition are kept in view.

iii. 3–5), and that at places the writer seems in difficulties as regards both his language and his grammar.[1]

But while these facts, taken by themselves, might be evidence of a later writer clumsily imitating another man's work,[2] may they not be equally well accounted for by a change (1) in the mood of the same writer, and (2) in the circumstances of those to whom he writes?

St. Paul was, we know, subject to great alternations of feeling, and when he wrote 2 Thessalonians, not only was he no longer under the same glad rebound from anxiety regarding the Thessalonians' state that he experienced when he wrote his First Epistle, but there is also evidence that at the time he was personally much harassed by "unreasonable and evil men" at Corinth (2 Thess. iii. 2: Acts xviii. 12 ff.). While, as regards the recipients of the letter, there are undoubted traces in the Second Epistle that between the time of its writing and the writing of the First St. Paul had heard of an increasing restlessness among his converts—a business which was no business (*μηδὲν ἐργαζομένους ἀλλὰ περιεργαζομένους*, 2 Thess. iii. 11)—which might well justify more authoritative and severe warnings on his part, without however implying the later Church-discipline (*Kirchenzucht*) which Schmiedel tries to discover in them.

Nor is it quite fair, as is generally done by those who lay stress on the closeness of the literary dependence between the two Thessalonian Epistles, to speak of it as without a parallel in early Christian literature. For to those who admit their authenticity we have within the circle of the Pauline Epistles themselves the kindred Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, exhibiting an identity of thought

[1] Commenting on i. 3–10, Bornemann remarks: "Man hat das Gefühl, als sei er nicht so fort mit seinen Worten ins rechte Gleis gekommen und müsse, zum Teil mit den Worten seines früheren Briefes, zum Teil mit alttestamentlichen und liturgischen Wendungen erst den Zug seiner Gedanken rangieren und sammeln" (*Die Thessalonicherbriefe*, p. 328).

[2] "Künstliche oder vielmehr verkünstelte Nacharbeit," Holtzmann, p. 100.

and language, such as to make them, notwithstanding their admitted differences in aim, almost duplicates of each other. And if St. Paul could thus repeat himself in two contemporary Epistles, addressed if not to the same Church at least to the same district, why should not a like similarity run through two other Epistles, written at an interval according to the traditional view of at most a few months, and dealing with a situation which, if differing in certain particulars, was in the main unchanged?

Further efforts to explain the extent of the resemblances between the two Epistles have also been made by suggesting that St. Paul had re-read the First immediately before writing the Second Epistle, or more precisely that he had in his hands the rough draft which his amanuensis had prepared of his first letter—a clean copy having been despatched to Thessalonica—and that he drew freely from it in dictating the terms of the second letter.[1]

One cannot say that this is impossible, and there would certainly be nothing according to the literary canons of the time to prevent a writer thus freely borrowing from his own previous work. But the very ingenuity of the suggestion is against it, and presupposes that the Apostle attached a greater importance to his own writings than their originally strictly occasional character warrants.

It is safer therefore to be content with such general explanations as have already been offered, or frankly to admit that the resemblances between the two Epistles constitute an interesting but, in our present state of ignorance regarding the exact circumstances of their writing, insoluble literary problem; though one which in no way militates against the Pauline authorship of the Second, unless other

[1] "Für den vielbeschäftigten und seines erregbaren Temperaments bewussten Pl. lag gerade in diesem Fall nichts näher, als das Concept des 1 Th., wenn ein solches vorhanden war, noch einmal durchzulesen, ehe er den 2 Th. diktirte." Zahn, *Einl. in das N.T.*, i. p. 179.

and more definite grounds for disputing it can be produced.

These grounds however, it is alleged, may be found in the strange character of much of the Epistle's doctrinal contents. And to this objection we must now turn.

III. Doctrinal Contents of 2 Thessalonians.

These are said, in the first place, to be inconsistent with the clear teaching of 1 Thessalonians, and, in the second place, to be in any case of such a character that it is not possible to think of St. Paul's having written them.

1. As regards the charge of inconsistency with 1 Thessalonians, that rests in the main on an alleged change of attitude with reference to the nearness of the Parousia, for that while in 1 Thessalonians the Parousia is represented as close at hand, and there is no mention of any sign by which it is to be preceded, in 2 Thessalonians we are distinctly told that it will not take place until the Man of lawlessness has been revealed.

To this it is generally replied that the two pictures are not really inconsistent, and that while there is nothing in the teaching regarding the Parousia in 1 Thessalonians to exclude the prior coming of the Man of lawlessness, there is equally nothing in his coming as depicted in the Second Epistle to delay unduly the expected Parousia of the First; all that is said is that Christ will not come just yet.[1]

But while there is undoubted force in this—and parallels for the conjunction of the two views, or rather for the two

[1] Baur admitted this in his earlier and, it seems to us, correcter view of the relation of the two Epistles on this point. "It is perfectly conceivable," he says, "that one and the same writer, if he lived so much in the thought of the *parousia* as the two Epistles testify, should have looked at this mysterious subject in different circumstances and from different points of view, and so expressed himself regarding it in different ways." *Paulus*, p. 488 [Eng. Tr. ii. p. 93]. And on "how confused a maze of eschatological conceptions could co-exist often in one and the same person" see Wernle, *Beginnings of Christianity*, Eng. Tr. i. p. 25.

aspects of the same truth may be cited from our Lord's eschatological discourse (St. Matt. xxiv. 29 ff.), and from the Apocalypse of St. John (Apoc. iii. 1, vi. 1 f.)—it is better not to attempt to reconcile the two positions too literally. There are many indications that St. Paul's eschatological views were at this time in a state of flux, and that in his teaching concerning the Last Things he was determined by practical and not theological motives, without much regard as to how far that teaching presented a consistent whole. And it may well have been that in the short time that had elapsed between the writing of 1 and 2 Thessalonians he had heard of circumstances in the Thessalonians' state which led him to emphasize afresh an aspect of the Parousia on which he had dwelt when in Thessalonica (2 Thess. ii. 5), but of which the Thessalonians had apparently lost sight, and which may further have gained a new significance in his own mind.

2. Even, however, if the point be thus turned against the charge of inconsistency, the question still remains whether it is at all likely that St. Paul, supposing him to have been the writer, would have so far departed from his general mode of thought in this particular passage, ii. 1–12. In none of his other New Testament writings do we find him laying stress on the "signs" preceding the end; nor does the person of Antichrist, with whom in general his conception corresponds, though the actual name is not used, again appear in his Epistles unless it be in the incidental notice of 2 Corinthians vi. 15 (*τίς δὲ συμφώνησις Χριστοῦ πρὸς Βελίαρ*;). But this in itself is not sufficient ground for maintaining that St. Paul can never have shared what we know to have been a widely spread belief of his time (comp. 1 John ii. 18, 22, iv. 3; 2 John 7; Apoc. xii. 13; Gfrörer, *Jahr. des Heils*, pt. ii. p. 257). And if he did not again lay the same stress on it, that may either have been because he had outgrown the belief in this particular

form, or because he did not again find himself confronted with circumstances which made such teaching either necessary or desirable.

Of course if the historical situation lying at the background of this teaching is to be sought in the antinomian Gnostic heresies of the second century, as Hilgenfeld, Bahnsen and Pfleiderer have from various points of view maintained, or even in the popular legend of Nero redivivus which has been widely believed from Kern and Baur down to P. Schmidt and Schmiedel, the Pauline authorship of the Epistle at once falls to the ground.

But, as has already been indicated, the doctrine of Antichrist did not come into existence with Montanism, but was firmly rooted in Jewish soil even before the Christian era; while, as regards the in some respects attractive Nero-hypothesis, the recent researches of Gunkel,[1] Bousset[2] and Charles[3] have made clear that it was at a much later date than the interests of this theory require, that those traits belonging to Antichrist were transferred to Nero, which alone could make him a fitting basis for the Pauline conception.

Nor can this conception be derived from the Johannine Apocalypse, as has again been frequently held. It is now very generally admitted by critics of all schools that the "hindrance" to the Man of lawlessness, of which the writer speaks, is to be found in the influence of the Roman Government, in perfect keeping with such later Pauline passages as Romans xiii. 1–7. But if so, it will be at once recognized how wholly different this is from the place assigned to Rome in the Apocalypse, drunk with "the blood of prophets and of saints, and of all that have been slain

[1] *Schöpfung und Chaos*, p. 221 ff.

[2] *Der Antichrist*, p. 13 f. See also Art. *Antichrist* in *Encycl. Biblica*.

[3] *The Ascension of Isaiah*, p. lxi. ff. "Schmiedel's view, which regards 2 Thess. ii. 1–12 . . . as a Beliar-Neronic myth (68–70 A.D.) is at conflict with the law of development as well as with all the evidence accessible on the subject." p. lxii. note 1.

upon the earth" (Apoc. xviii. 24; comp. vi. 9–11, vii. 14, xiv. 8, xvi. 19).

The whole conception indeed, as it meets us here, is purely religious, not political, and it is in the Old Testament, in the teaching of Jesus, and, more particularly as regards form, in certain Jewish apocalyptic beliefs that its roots are to be found.

Further than this, without entering on many of the vexed questions of interpretation which the passage raises, it is impossible to go at present. But if what has just been said is correct, it will be seen that, obscure though the passage undoubtedly is, there is still nothing in it to make its Pauline authorship impossible, or even improbable; while its genuinely Pauline style, and its natural place in the argument of the Epistle, are strong evidence in favour of the traditional view.

In this general conclusion we are confirmed by the unsatisfactory and conflicting nature of the rival theories which are offered of the origin and intention of 2 Thessalonians by those who deny its authenticity—theories which land us in greater difficulties than any they serve to remove. Incidental notice has been taken of some of these theories already, but there are three in particular which call for further remark.[1]

1. There is, in the first place, the theory of Interpolation, which has been so frequently resorted to lately to explain, or explain away, difficulties in New Testament interpretation, and which in the present instance has at least this in its favour, that we have abundant signs of its presence in the apocalyptic literature of the period. May it not then have been at work here? May not, as P. Schmidt

[1] On the necessity of the impugners of the Epistle's authenticity supplying us with an intelligible account of its origin, see Bornemann, *Komm.*, p. 478, and comp. Wrede's frank admission, "Vor allem darf es nicht bei der blossen Negation bleiben: es muss gefragt werden, wie der Brief positiv als pseudonymes Schriftstück zu begreifen ist." p. 3.

suggests, i. 1–4, ii. 1, 2[a], ii. 13–18 have formed a true Pauline Epistle, into which a later writer interpolated the two passages which have caused most difficulty, i. 5–12 and ii. 1–12?[1]

But apart altogether from the arbitrariness of any such theory, and the total absence of MS. evidence in support of it, the result is to leave a letter so shorn of all its distinctive features that it is difficult to see how St. Paul could ever have thought of writing it. And further, a careful study of the Epistle as a whole shows that these two sections are so closely related both to what immediately precedes, and to what follows, that they cannot be separated from them without violence.

2. Of greater interest is the view which Spitta develops in his study on the Epistle contained in *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristenthums* (Band i. pp. 111 ff., Göttingen, 1893). Starting from the "inferiority" of the Second Epistle to the First, he holds that, with the exception of the authenticating paragraph at the end, iii. 17, 18, it is the work not of St. Paul, but of Timothy. And in this way he thinks that he finds an adequate explanation both of its generally Pauline character and of its peculiarities—of the former because it was written by Timothy in close correspondence with St. Paul and by his commission, of the latter because the Jewish cast of its apocalyptic passages is in thorough harmony with what we learn elsewhere regarding Timothy's Jewish upbringing (see Acts xvi. 1; 2 Tim. i. 5, iii. 14 f.).

But, to take the last point first, was Timothy after all more of a Jew than St. Paul? And difficult though it may be to reconcile on paper the attitude towards the Jews which underlies the "little apocalypse" of ii. 1–12 with that afterwards elaborated in Romans xi., Dr. Moffat[2] prop-

[1] *Der Erste Thessalonicherbrief*, p. 111 ff. (Berlin, 1885).
[2] *The Historical New Testament*, p. 626.

erly insists that "it would be psychologically false to deny the compatibility of both positions at different periods within a single personality." By the time Romans xi. came to be written, the Apostle was "more dispassionate and patriotic," or, shall we not rather say? had attained to wider views of the possibilities God had in store for His people.

It is in the want however of any satisfactory direct evidence in support of it that the real weakness of Spitta's theory may be seen. For the verse on which he relies so much will certainly not bear the strain put upon it. "Remember ye not, that, when I was yet (ἔτι) with you, I told you these things?" (2 Thess. ii. 5). The ἔτι, so Spitta argues, points to a time very shortly before that at which the writer is writing.[1] And as Timothy had been at Thessalonica more recently than St. Paul, the reference is thought to be naturally to his visit. But is there any need of applying ἔτι in any such restricted sense? All that it implies is the desire on the writer's part to carry his readers back with him to the time when he was with them, whenever that time may have been. And further, is it conceivable that ἔλεγον can be understood of any other than the leading Apostle St. Paul, more particularly in view of the admitted reference of the first person singular to him in 2 Thessalonians iii. 17 and 1 Thessalonians iii. 5, v. 27, the only other passages in the two Epistles where it is used of the writer? Had Timothy wished to distinguish himself here from his two companions, Paul and Silvanus, would he not certainly have added his name ἐγὼ ὁ Τιμόθεος, or some such expression, and not have trusted to the Thessalonians' recognizing his handwriting as different from that of St. Paul in the closing paragraph (iii. 17, 18), as Spitta is driven to suggest.[2]

[1] "Auf eine Anwesenheit in Thessalonich, welche bereits längere Zeit vergangen ist, passt der Ausdruck nicht." p. 124.

[2] "Ein Missverständnis war ja für die Briefempfänger nicht wohl möglich, davon zu geschweigen, dass sie des Timotheus Handschrift wer-

That Timothy may on this occasion have acted as St. Paul's amanuensis is of course possible; and it is perhaps in the thought of a change of amanuensis from (say) Silvanus in the First Epistle that some of our Epistle's linguistic peculiarities may find an explanation. But this is very different from supposing that Timothy was actually its author, or that the Apostle set his own seal to views with which he was not wholly in agreement, as Spitta's theory requires.

3. If then the writer was not St. Paul, there is nothing left for us but to fall back upon the suggestion which has been urged from time to time in various forms, that the Epistle is the work of an unknown writer, who, anxious to gain currency for his own views regarding the Last Things, imbedded them in a framework skilfully drawn from St. Paul's genuine Epistle.

We have seen already the objections attending any such theory, in so far as it is connected with a definite historical situation such as the expected return of Nero. But apart altogether from such considerations, is it likely that a fictitious Epistle addressed on this showing to a Church which had already an authentic Epistle of St. Paul's, and in which many of the original recipients may well have been alive, would ever have gained currency as the Apostle's?

So strongly does Wrede, the latest exponent of the theory, feel this that he suggests that the Epistle was never intended for Thessalonica at all, but that the unknown writer simply made a general use of 1 Thessalonians, as, owing to its apocalyptic character, best serving the purpose he had in view.[1] So that it comes to this: That this

den gekannt haben im Unterschied von der des Paulus in der Schlussbemerkung, 3, 18. Somit ergiebt es sich mit ziemlicher Sicherheit, dass der im Namen von Paulus, Silvanus und Timotheus ausgegangene 2. Thess.-Brief von den letzten dieser drei abgefasst und von den ersten nur mit einem eigenhändigen Schlusswort versehen ist." p. 125.

[1] pp. 38 ff., 68.

Epistle, so amply vouched for in antiquity, is nothing but a barefaced forgery[1]—written in the name of St. Paul by one who was not St. Paul—invested with the authority of the Apostle, though designed to correct views currently attributed to the Apostle—and addressed to the Church of Thessalonica, though having another and a very different circle of readers in view. Surely there are more "misses" here than any "hits," with which, according to the most charitable interpretation of it, the theory can be credited!

Nor does the view of forgery, so improbable in itself, derive any real help from two passages which are often cited in support of it, and as in themselves conclusive against the Epistle's genuineness.

The first of these is ii. 2: "To the end that ye be not shaken from your mind, nor yet be troubled, either by spirit, or by word, or by epistle as from us, as that the day of the Lord is now present." But even if the difficult clause, *μήτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς ὡς δι' ἡμῶν*, be taken as referring to the possible existence of a pretended or forged epistle, and is not merely the exhausting by the writer of the different ways by which the Thessalonians might have been disturbed—spirit, word, letter—it represents at most just such a vague suspicion as might have crossed St. Paul's mind (comp. 1 Thess. v. 27), but which would have been exceedingly unnatural in one who was himself engaged in passing off a spurious letter.

The same may be said of iii. 17: "The salutation of me Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every epistle: so I write." The particular form of authentication

[1] It is unfortunate to have to use the word "forgery"—round which such definite associations have now gathered—in connexion with our problem; but I know no other word that brings out so well the deliberate attempt of one man to use the name and authority of another in his writing. In view of iii. 17, 18, there can be no talk here of a harmless pseudonymous writing. Comp. Wrede, p. 86: "Stammt der zweite Thessalonicherbrief nicht von Paulus, so ist er eine Fälschung."

used here is unique among the Pauline Epistles; and if it had been the work of a forger, he would surely have been more careful to follow St. Paul's general usage, as it meets us in 1 Corinthians xvi. 21, or Colossians iv. 18. Whereas "if Paul wrote the words, they express his intention," as Dr. Drummond has pointed out, "and this intention was satisfactorily fulfilled if he always added the benediction in his own handwriting." [1]

On the whole then, without any desire to minimize the difficulties surrounding the literary character and much of the contents of this remarkable Epistle, I can find nothing in them to throw undue suspicion on its genuineness; while the failure of those who reject it to present any adequate explanation of how it arose, or of the authority it undoubtedly possessed in the Early Church, is in itself strong presumptive evidence that the traditional view is correct, and that we have here an authentic work of the Apostle Paul.

GEORGE MILLIGAN.

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.

IF we may judge from the number of 'primitive errors' suspected by WH in this short Epistle, it would seem that the text is in a less satisfactory condition than that of any other portion of the New Testament. There are no less than four such errors in these thirty verses, the same number as are found in the eight chapters of the two Petrine Epistles, and in the forty-four chapters of the first two Gospels. In what follows I give the text of WH.

v. 1. *Τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοις καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς.*

Here *ἠγαπημένοις* is supported by ABℵ, several cursives and ver-

[1] *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians, etc.* (International Handbook to the New Testament), p. 13.

sions, Orig. iii. 607, Lucif. Cassiod. *al.*, while *ἡγιασμένοις* is read by KLP *al.* WH (in *App.* p. 576, and *Notes on Sel. Readings*, p. 106) say that "the text is probably a primitive error for *τοῖς θεῷ . . . καὶ ἐν* I. X." For the reading *ἐν* I. X. they cite Vulg. Spec. Syr. Bdl. Theb. Aeth. Orig. *Mt.*, Lucif. Cassiod.

The objection to the text rests on internal grounds. There appears to be no parallel either for *ἐν Θεῷ Πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοι*, or for *Χριστῷ τετηρημένοι*, whereas the preposition *ἐν* is constantly used to express the relation in which believers stand to *Christ* as the members of His body. If Bishop Lightfoot is right in saying (on Col. 3. 12) that in the New Testament the word *ἠγαπημένοι* "seems to be always used of the object of God's love," it is difficult to see the propriety of the phrase "Brethren beloved by God in God." Omitting the preposition we have the dative of the agent, as in Nehemiah 13. 26, *ἀγαπώμενος τῷ Θεῷ ἦν*. Nor does it seem a natural expression to speak of "those who are kept *for* Christ (so Alford, Spitta, B. Weiss, v. Soden, *al.*); rather believers are kept *by* and *in* Christ, as in 2 Thessalonians 3. 3, Apocalypse 3. 10. The easiest way of accounting for the error is to suppose that *ἐν* was accidentally omitted, and then corrected in the margin and inserted in the wrong place. Possibly the wrong insertion of *ἐν* may have suggested or facilitated the change from *ἠγαπημένοις* to *ἡγιασμένοις*. If this is so, it suggests that our MSS. are derived from an archetype which was a far from exact copy of the original autograph.

v. 5. *ὑπομνῆσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι εἰδότας ἅπαξ πάντα, ὅτι κύριος λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν.* I quote Tregelles' notes with additions from Tischendorf in round brackets.

ειδοτας "*add. υμας* ς- ℵ. 31. KL, *om.* ABC² 13 Vulg. Syrr. Bdl. and Hcl. Memph. Theb. Arm.," and so Tisch.

In point of fact, however, B reads *ειδοτας υμας*, as any one may convince himself by looking at Cozza-Luzi's photo-

graphic reproduction. The preponderance of authority is therefore in favour of this latter reading. The repeated ὑμᾶς emphasizes the contrast between the readers ("to remind *you*, you who know it already") and the libertines previously spoken of. The repetition here may be compared with the repeated ὑμῖν of *v.* 3.

ἅπαξ *Hic.* ABC. 13. 31. L. *vv.* *Ante* λαον ℵ. (Syr. Bdl. Syr. Hcl. Sah. Cop.) Arm. *Ante* ὁτι K. *Ante* εκ γης Αιγ. Clem. 280 (and 997, Did. Cassiod.). *Om.* Lucif. 28.

παντα ABCℵ. 13 Vulg. Syr. Hcl. Memph. Arm. Aeth. Lucif. [In the *App.* to WH (*Sel. Readings*, p. 106) it is suggested that this may be a primitive error for παντας (cf. 1 John 2. 20) found in Syr. Bodl.]. τουτο] ς. 31. KL. Theb.

ὁτι] *add.* ὁ ς.C.^{2} 31. KL. Arm. Clem. 280. *Om.* ABℵ. 13.

κυριος] ℵCKL. Syr. Hcl. Θεος C^2 Tol. Syr. Bdl. Arm. Clem. Lucif. Ιησους AB. 13 Vulg. Memph. Theb. Aeth. [In *App.* to WH (*Sel. Readings*, p. 106) it is suggested that there may have been some primitive error, "apparently ΟΤΙΚC̄ (ὅτι Κύριος), and ΟΤΙΙC̄ (ὅτι Ἰησοῦς) for ΟΤΙΟ (ὅτι ὁ)."]

It appears to me that the true reading of the passage is ὑπομνῆσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότας ὑμᾶς πάντα, ὅτι Κύριος ἅπαξ λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν. I see no difficulty in πάντα, which gives a reason for the use of the word ὑπομνῆσαι, "I need only *remind you*, because *you* already *know all* that I have to say." It was easy for the second ὑμᾶς to be omitted as unnecessary, and then the word ἅπαξ might be inserted in its place partly for rhythmical reasons; but it is really unmeaning after εἰδότας: the knowledge of the incidents, which are related in this and the following verses, is not a knowledge for good and all, such as the faith spoken of in *v.* 3. On the other hand, ἅπαξ is very appropriate if taken with λαὸν σώσας (a people was saved out of Egypt once for all), and it prepares the way for τὸ δεύτερον, as in Theoph. *ad Aut.* ii. 26, ἵνα τὸ μὲν ἅπαξ ᾖ πεπληρωμένον ὅτε ἐτέθη, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον μέλλῃ πληροῦσθαι μετὰ τὴν κρίσιν. On the other hand, πάντας seems to me inappropriate. Can it be

assumed that *all* who are addressed should be familiar with the legends contained in the Book of Enoch and the Ascension of Moses, to which allusion is made in what follows? It is surely much more to the point for the writer to say, as he does again below (*v.* 17), that he is only repeating what is *generally* known, though it need not be known to every individual. As to Hort's suggestion on the word *κύριος*, that the original was *ὅτι ὁ (λαὸν σώσας)*, the difficulties in its way seem to be: (1) That such a periphrastic expression for God is unusual; (2) that the supposed corruptions are not very easily explained; (3) that a further difficulty is introduced if we suppose *θεὸς* or *κύριος* to have been accidentally omitted by the original scribe. Spitta considers that the abbreviations $\overline{\text{ΙC}}$, $\overline{\text{ΚC}}$, $\overline{\text{ΘC}}$ might easily be confused if the first letter was faintly written, and that the mention of *τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον I.X.* in the preceding verse would naturally lead a later copyist to prefer $\overline{\text{ΙC}}$, a supposition which is confirmed by Cramer's *Catena*, p. 158, *εἴρηται γὰρ πρὸ τούτων περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὡς εἴη ἀληθινὸς θεὸς οὗτος ὁ μόνος δεσπότης ὁ κύριος I.X., ὁ ἀναγαγὼν τὸν λαὸν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου διὰ Μωσέως.* Spitta himself, however, holds that $\overline{\text{ΘC}}$ is the true reading, as it agrees with the corresponding passage in 2 Peter 2. 4, *ὁ θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο*, and with Clement's paraphrase (*Adumbr.* Dind. iii. p. 482): "Quoniam Dominus Deus semel populum de terra Aegypti liberans deinceps eos qui non crediderunt perdidit." There is no instance in the New Testament of the personal name "Jesus" being used of the pre-existent Messiah, though the official name "Christ" is found in 1 Corinthians 10. 4, 9, in reference to the wandering in the wilderness. But in the second and later centuries this distinction was less carefully observed. Thus Justin M. (*Dial.* 120), speaking of the prophecy in Genesis 49. 10, says that it does not refer to Judah, but to Jesus, *τὸν καὶ τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐξαγαγόντα,*

and this use of the name was confirmed by the idea that the son of Nun was a personification of Christ (see Justin, *Dial.* 75; Clem. Al. 133; Didymûs, *De Trin.* 1. 19, *Ἰούδας καθολικῶς γράφει, ἅπαξ γὰρ κύριος Ἰησοῦς λαὸν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου σώσας κ.τ.λ.*; Jerome, *C. Jov.* 1. 12; Lact. *Inst.* 4. 17, Christi figuram gerebat ille Jesus, qui cum primum Auses vocaretur, Moyses futura praesentiens jussit eum Jesum vocari).

v. 19. *οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες.*

ἀποδιορίζοντες add. ἑαυτους C. Vulg. *Om.* ABℵKL 13, etc.

This rare word is used of logical distinctions in Arist. *Pol.* iv. 48, *ὥσπερ οὖν εἰ ζῴου προηρούμεθα λαβεῖν εἴδη, πρῶτον ἂν ἀποδιωρίζομεν ὅπερ ἀναγκαῖον πᾶν ἔχειν ζῷον* ("as, if we wished to make a classification of animals, we should have begun by setting aside that which all animals have in common"), and I believe in every other passage in which it is known to occur. Schott, B. Weiss and Huther-Kühl would give it a similar sense in this passage, supposing the words *ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες* to be spoken by, or at least to express the feeling of *οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες*: "welche Unterscheidungen machen, *sc.* zwischen Psychikern und Pneumatikern, wobei dann der Verfasser diese Unterscheidungen in seiner drastischen Weise sofort zu ihren Ungunsten umkehrt." This explanation seems to me to give a better sense than the gloss approved by Spitta, *οἱ τὰ σχίσματα ποιοῦντες*; for one cause of the danger which threatens the Church is that the innovators do not separate themselves openly, but steal in unobserved (*παρεισεδύησαν*, *v.* 4), and take part in the love-feasts of the faithful, in which they are like sunken rocks (*v.* 12); and, secondly, it is by no means certain that the word *ἀποδιορίζω* could bear this sense. *ἀφορίζω* is used in Luke 6. 22 of excommunication by superior authority, which of course would not be

applicable here. On the other hand, it seems impossible to get the former sense out of the Greek as it stands. Even if we allowed the possibility of such a harsh construction as to put ψυχικοί in inverted commas, as the utterance of the innovators, still we cannot use the same word over again to express Jude's "drastic" retort. This difficulty would be removed if we suppose the loss of a line to the following effect after ἀποδιορίζοντες :—

> ψυχικοὺς ὑμᾶς (or τοὺς πιστοὺς) λέγοντες, ὄντες αὐτοὶ ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες.

We may compare Clement's paraphrase in the *Adumbrationes* (Dind. vol. iii. p. 483, more correctly given in Zahn, *Forsch.* iii. p. 85). *Isti sunt*[1] inquit *segregantes* fideles a fidelibus secundum propriam infidelitatem redarguti[2] et iterum [non][3] discernentes sancta[4] a canibus.[5] *Animales* inquit *spiritum non habentes*, spiritum scilicet, qui est per fidem secundum usum justitiae.

[The authorities are two MSS. Cod. Laudun. 96, sec. ix. (L), Cod. Berol. Phill. 1665, sec. xiii. (M), and the Ed. Pr. of De la Bigne 1575 (P).]

Zahn endeavours to defend the reading *sancta a canibus* by quoting Clem. *Str.* ii. 7, τῶν δὲ ἁγίων μεταδιδόναι τοῖς κυσὶν ἀπαγορεύεται, which seems to me entirely alien to the general drift of the passage. Starting with the *carnibus* of the oldest MS., I think we should read *carnalibus*. If we retain *sancta*, I should be inclined to understand this in reference to the behaviour of the libertines at the love-feasts described in *v.* 12, which may be compared with 1 Corinthians 11. 29, ὁ γὰρ ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων ἀναξίως κρίμα ἑαυτῷ ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα. But perhaps we

[1] *Sunt* M, *om.* LP.

[2] *Redarguti* MP, *redargui* L.

[3] *Non* inserted by Zahn (Mr. Barnard suggests *parum* for *iterum*).

[4] *Sancta* L has the word between the lines.

[5] *Canibus* MP, *carnibus* L ("wenn ich nicht die Variante übersehen habe").

should read *sanctos* and transpose the clauses as follows:—

Isti segregantes: fideles a fidelibus et iterum sanctos a carnalibus discernentes secundum propriam incredulitatem, redarguti, *animales spiritum non habentes*, the Greek being something of this sort: *οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες. πιστοὺς τῶν πιστῶν, ἁγίους δὲ αὖ τῶν ψυχικῶν διακρίνοντες κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ἀπιστίαν, ἐλέγχονται ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες.*

The opposition of *ψυχικοὶ* to *πνευματικοὶ* is familiar in the writings of Tertullian after he became a Montanist. The Church is carnal, the sect spiritual. So the Valentinians distinguished their own adherents as *pneumatici* from the *psychici* who composed the Church. These were also technical terms with the Naassenes and Heracleon (see my notes on James 3. 15), and were probably borrowed by the early heretics from St. Paul, who uses them to distinguish the natural from the heavenly body (1 Cor. 15. 44), and also to express the presence or absence of spiritual insight (1 Cor. 2. 14), *ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος οὐ δέχεται τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ θεοῦ, μωρία γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐστιν . . . ὁ δὲ πνευματικὸς ἀνακρίνει πάντα.* The innovators against whom St. Jude writes seem to have been professed followers of St. Paul (like the Marcionites afterwards), abusing the doctrine of Free Grace which they had learnt from him (*v.* 4, *τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν*), professing a knowledge of the *βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ* (1 Cor. 2. 12), though it was really a knowledge only of *τὰ βαθέα τοῦ Σατανᾶ* (Apoc. 2. 24), and claiming to be the true *δυνατοὶ* and *πνευματικοὶ*, as denying dead works and setting the spirit above the letter. This explains the subsequent misrepresentation of St. Paul as a heresiarch in the Pseudo-Clementine writings.

vv. 22, 23. (Text of Tischendorf and Tregelles) *καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ, μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα.* (Text of WH and B. Weiss)

καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ, μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὰς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα. In *App.* to WH it is added, "Some primitive error probable: perhaps the first ἐλεᾶτε an interpolation" (*Sel. Readings*, p. 107).

22. ελεγχετε AC* 13. Vulg. Memph. Arm. Aeth. (Eph. Theophyl. Œc. *Comm.* Cassiod.). ελεατε BC² ℵ Syr. Hcl. ελεειτε KLP (Theophyl. Œc. *txt.*), εκ πυρος αρπαζετε (hic) Syr. Bdl. Clem. 773.

διακεινομενους ABCℵ. 13. Vulg. Syrr. Bdl. et Hcl. Arm. Clem. 773. διακρινομενοι KLP+

23. οὑς δε AℵC. 13. KLP. Vulg. Syr. Hcl. Memph. Arm. *Om.* B., δε Syr. Bdl. Clem.

σωζετε ABCℵ. 13. Vulg. Memph. Arm. Aeth., εν φοβῳ σωζετε KLP+, ελεειτε Clem. 773 (quoted below). ελεατε αυτους εν φοβῳ Syr. Bdl. εκ πυρος ABCKLPℵ. 13. Arm. *Om.* σωζετε εκ πυρος αρπαζοντες Syr.

ἁρπαζοντες οὓς δε ελεατε εν φοβῳ ABℵ. 13. Vulg. Memph. Arm., ἁρπαζοντες εν φοβῳ C. Syr. Hcl. ἁρπαζοντες KLP+

Tischendorf makes the matter clearer by giving the consecutive text of versions and quotations as follows: Vulg. *Et hos quidem arguite judicatos, illos vero salvate de igne rapientes, aliis autem miseremini in timore.* Ar^{c}. *Et quosdam corripite super peccatis eorum, et quorundam miseremini cum fuerint victi, et quosdam salvate ex igne et liberate eos.* Ar^{p}. *Et signate quosdam cum dubitaverint orbos* (?) *et salvate quosdam territione, abripite eos ex igne.* Aeth. *quoniam est quem redarguent per verbum quod dictum est* (Aeth$^{p.p.}$ *propter peccatum eorum*), *et est qui et servabitur ex igne et rapient eum, et est qui servabitur timore et poenitentia.* Arm. *Et quosdam damnantes sitis reprehensione, et quosdam salvate rapiendo ex igne, et quorundam miseremini timore judicando* (? *indicando*). Cassiodor.[142] *Ita ut quosdam dijudicatos arguant, quosdam de adustione aeterni ignis eripiant, nonnullis misereantur errantibus et conscientias maculatas emundent, sic tamen ut peccata eorum digna execratione refugiant.* Commentaries of Theophylact and Œcumenius, κἀκείνους δὲ, εἰ μὲν ἀποδιΐστανται ὑμῶν —τοῦτο γὰρ σημαίνει τὸ διακρίνεσθαι—ἐλέγχετε, τουτέστι φανεροῦτε τοῖς πᾶσι τὴν

ἀσέβειαν αὐτῶν· εἴτε δὲ πρὸς ἴασιν ἀφορῶσι, μὴ ἀπωθεῖσθε, ἀλλὰ τῷ τῆς ἀγάπης ὑμῶν ἐλέῳ προσλαμβάνεσθε, σώζοντες ἐκ τοῦ ἠπειλημένου αὐτοῖς πυρός· προσλαμβάνεσθε δὲ μετὰ τοῦ ἐλεεῖν αὐτοὺς καὶ μετὰ φόβου.

In all these it will be observed that three classes are distinguished, as in the text of Tregelles and Tischendorf, and in A. *οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ*, and ℵ, *οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οὓς δε ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ*. We should draw the same conclusion from the seeming quotation in *Can. Apost.* vi. 4 (*οὐ μισήσεις πάντα ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ*) *οὓς μὲν ἐλέγξεις, οὓς δὲ ἐλεήσεις, περὶ ὧν δὲ προσεύξῃ* (*οὓς δὲ ἀγαπήσεις ὑπὲρ τὴν ψυχήν σου*), which occurs also, with the omission of the clause *οὓς δὲ ἐλεήσεις* in the Didache ii. 7.

Two classes only are distinguished in the following: Syr. Bdl. *Et quosdam de illis quidem ex igne rapite; cum autem resipuerint, miseremini super eis in timore*, representing *καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζετε, διακρινομένους δὲ ἐλεᾶτε αὐτοὺς ἐν φοβῳ*. Syr. Hcl. *et hos quidem miseremini resipiscentes, hos autem servate de igne rapientes in timore*, representing *καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες ἐν φόβῳ*. Clem. *Adumbr. quosdam autem salvate de igne rapientes, quibusdam vero miseremini in timore*,[1] representing *οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ*. Clem. *Strom.* vi. 773, *καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζετε, διακρινομένους δὲ ἐλεεῖτε*, implying that he was acquainted with two different recensions. With these we may compare the texts of B, followed by WH and B. Weiss, *καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ*, of C, *καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες ἐν φόβῳ*, and of KLP, *καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεεῖτε*

[1] The paraphrase continues, *id est ut eos qui in ignem cadunt docealis ut semet ipsos liberent.* (It would seem that this clause has got misplaced and should be inserted after *rapientes.*) *Odientes, inquit, eam, quae carnalis est, maculatam tunicam; animae videlicet tunica macula* (read *maculata*) *est spiritus concupiscentiis pollutus carnalibus.*

διακρινόμενοι, οὓς δὲ ἐν φόβῳ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες.

St. Jude's predilection for triplets, as seen in *vv.* 2, 4, 8, in the examples of judgment in *vv.* 5–7, and of sin in *v.* 11, is *primâ facie* favourable to the triple division in this passage. Supposing we take A and ℵ to represent the original, consisting of three members, *a b c*, we find B complete in *a* and *c*, but confused as to *b*. As it stands, it gives an impossible reading; since it requires οὓς μὲν to be taken as the relative, introducing the subordinate verb ἐλεᾶτε, depending on the principal verb σώζετε; while οὓς δὲ, on the other hand, must be taken as demonstrative. WH suggest that ἐλεᾶτε has crept in from below. Omitting this, we get the sense, "Some who doubt save, snatching them from fire; others compassionate in fear." It seems an easier explanation to suppose that ἐλεᾶτε was written in error for ἐλέγχετε, and οὓς omitted in error after διακρινομένους. The latter phenomenon is exemplified in the readings of Syr. Bdl. and Clem. *Str.* 773. The texts of C and KLP are complete in *a* and *b*, but insert a phrase from *c* in *b*. The most natural explanation here seems to be that the duplition of ἐλεᾶτε in *a* and *c* (as in Cod. ℵ) caused the omission of the second ἐλεᾶτε, and therefore of the second οὓς δὲ. The reading διακρινόμενοι in KLP was a natural assimilation to the following nominative ἁρπάζοντες, and seemed, to those who were not aware of the difference in the meaning of the active and middle of διακρίνω, to supply a very appropriate thought, viz. that discrimination must be used; treatment should differ in different cases.

The real difficulty, however, of the triple division is to arrive at a clear demarcation between the classes alluded to. "The triple division," says Hort (*App.* p. 107), "gives no satisfactory sense"; and it certainly has been very diversely interpreted, some holding with Kühl that the first case is the worst and the last the most hopeful: "Die dritte Klasse . . . durch helfendes Erbarmen wieder hergestellt werden können, mit denen es also nicht so schlimm

steht, wie mit denen, welchen gegenüber nur ἐλέγχειν zu üben ist; aber auch nicht so schlimm, wie mit denen, die nur durch rasche, zugreifende That zu retten sind"; while the majority take Reiche's view of a climax: "a dubitantibus minusque depravatis . . . ad insanabiles, quibus opem ferre pro tempore ab ipsorum contumacia prohibemur." My own view is that Jude does not here touch on the case of the heretical leaders, of whom he has spoken with such severity before. In their present mood they are not subjects of ἔλεος, any more than the Pharisees condemned by our Lord, as long as they persisted in their hostility to the truth. The admonition here given by St. Jude seems to be the same as that contained in the last verse of the Epistle written by his brother long before: *ἐάν τις ἐν ὑμῖν πλανηθῇ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ ἐπιστρέψῃ τις αὐτὸν, γινώσκετε ὅτι ὁ ἐπιστρέψας ἁμαρτωλὸν ἐκ πλάνης αὐτοῦ σώσει ψυχὴν ἐκ θανάτου.* The first class with which the believers are called upon to deal is that of doubters, διακρινόμενοι, men still halting between two opinions (cf. James 1. 6), or we might understand the word of disputatiousness, as in Jude 9. These they are to reprove and convince (cf. John 16. 9, *ἐλέγξει περὶ ἁμαρτίας ὅτι οὐ πιστεύουσιν εἰς ἐμέ*). Then follow two classes undistinguished by any special characteristic, whose condition we can only conjecture from the course of action to be pursued respecting them. The second class is evidently in more imminent danger than the one we have already considered, since they are to be saved by immediate energetic action, snatching them from the fire; the third seems to be beyond human help, since the duty of the believers is limited to trembling compassion, expressing itself no doubt in prayer, but apparently shrinking from personal communication with the terrible infection of evil. We may compare with this St. Paul's judgment as to the case of incest in the Church of Corinth (1 Cor. 5. 5), and the story told about Cerinthus and St. John.

J. B. Mayor.

CHARACTERISTICS OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

V.

We pass on to the syntax, and begin naturally with that of the noun. There are grammatical categories here that scarcely ask for more than bare mention. On the subject of *Number* there is one obvious thing to say—the dual has gone. Many Greek dialects, Ionic conspicuously, had discarded this hoary luxury long before the Common Greek was born, and no theory of the relation of the *Κοινή* to the dialects would allow Attic to force on the resultant speech a set of forms so useless as these. The dual may well have arisen in distant prehistoric days when men could not count beyond two, and it is evidently suffering from senile decay in the very earliest monuments we possess of Indo-Germanic language. It was at home in Attica—witness the inscriptions, and folk-songs like the "Harmodius"—but it never invaded Hellenistic, not even when a Hebrew dual might have been exactly rendered by its aid. We shall see when we come to the adjectives that the disappearance of the distinction between duality and plurality had wider results than the mere banishment of the dual number from nouns and verbs. Apart from this matter the only noteworthy point under Number is the marked weakening of the old principle that neuter plurals (in their origin identical with collectives in -*a*[1]) took a singular verb. In the New Testament we have a large extension of what in classical Greek was a comparatively rare licence, allowing the plural verb when the individual items in the subject are separately in

[1] See Giles, *Manual of Comparative Philology*, pp. 264 ff. (I might add here that Mr. Giles thinks the dual may have been originally a specialized form of the plural, used (as in Homer always) to describe natural or artificial *pairs*. That this is its earliest extant use is certain, but its origin may very well have been as conjectured above.)

view, while the singular treats the subject as a collective unity. The liberty of using the plural freely makes the use of the singular distinctly more significant than it could be in classical Greek.

It might be added that the converse phenomenon, known as the *Schema Pindaricum*, is found in the New Testament: cf. Mark iv. 41, 1 Cor. xv. 50, Matt. v. 18, Rev. ix. 12.

On *Gender* likewise there is not much to say. There are sundry differences in the gender of particular words; but even Modern Greek is nearly as much under the domination of this outworn excrescence on language as was its classical ancestor. That English should still be the only prominent language to discard gender, indicating only distinction of sex, is exceedingly strange.

We are free now to examine the phenomena of *Case*. To estimate the position of Hellenistic along the line of development, we may sum up in a few words the features of the two ends of this line. Modern Greek has only the three cases we ourselves possess, nominative, accusative and genitive. (The survival of a few vocative forms, in which Modern and Hellenistic Greek are on practically the same footing, does not affect this point, for the vocative is not really a case.) At the very dawn of Greek language-history, as we know it, there is only one more, the dative, though we can detect a few moribund traces of instrumental, locative and ablative. For all practical purposes we may say that Greek lost in prehistoric times three out of the primitive seven cases (or eight, if we include the vocative), viz., the *from* case (ablative), the *with* case (instrumental[1]), and the *at* or *in* case (locative), all of which survived in Sanskrit, and appreciably in Latin, though there obscured

[1] The instrumental proper all but coincided with the dative in form throughout the 1st and 2nd declensions, so that the still surviving dative of instrument may in these declensions be regarded as the ancient case; the *comitative* "with," however, was always expressed by a preposition except in the idiom *αὐτοῖς ἀνδράσι*.

by the syncretism of ablative, instrumental and (except in singular of *-ā-* and *-o-* nouns) locative, in respect of form. In other words, the purely local cases, in which the meaning could be brought out by a place-adverb (for this purpose called a preposition), sacrificed their distinct forms and usages.[1] Greek is accordingly marked, like English, by the very free use of prepositions. This characteristic is very obviously intensified in Hellenistic, where we are perpetually finding prepositional phrases used to express relations which in classical Greek would have been adequately given by a case alone. It is needless to illustrate this here, except with one typical example which will fitly introduce the next point to be discussed. I have already (p. 73) referred to the instrumental ἐν, formerly regarded as a translation of the familiar Hebrew ב, but now well established as vernacular Greek of Ptolemaic and later times. The examples we have happen to be all from the category "armed with," but it seems fair to argue that an instrumental sense for ἐν is generally available if the context strongly pleads for it, without regarding this restriction or assuming Hebraism.[2] What gave birth to this extension of the uses of ἐν? It seems certain that it implies a growing lack of clearness in the simple dative, which produced an unwillingness to trust it to express the required meaning without further definition. We may see in the growth of prepositions an incipient symptom of that simplification of cases which culminates in the abbreviated case system of to-day.

It is very easy for a New Testament student to overlook

[1] Note that the *to* case also disappeared, the "terminal accusative" seen in the Latin *ire Romam*. The surviving cases accordingly represent purely grammatical relations, those of subject, object, possession, remoter object and instrument.

[2] I should not wish to exclude the possibility that this ἐν, although correct vernacular Greek, came to be used rather disproportionately by translators from Hebrew, or by men whose mother tongue was Aramaic. The use would be explained on the same lines as ἰδού on p. 72.

entirely the fact that the dative has already entered the way that leads to extinction. I take a page at random from St. Mark in Westcott and Hort's text, and count 21 datives against 23 genitives and 25 accusatives. A random page from a Teubner Herodotus gives me only 10, against 23 and 29 respectively; one from Plato 11, against 12 and 25. Such figures could obviously prove nothing conclusive until they were continued over a large area, but they may be taken as evidence that the dative is not dead yet in the first century. Taking the New Testament as a whole, the dative with prepositions falls behind the accusative and genitive in the proportion 15 to 19 and 17 respectively. This makes the dative considerably more prominent than in classical and post-classical historians.[1] The preponderance is, however, due solely to ἐν, the commonest of all the prepositions, outnumbering εἰς by about three to two: were both these omitted, the dative would come down to 2½ in the above proportion, while the accusative would still be 10. And although ἐν has greatly enlarged its sphere of influence[2] in the New Testament as compared with literary *Κοινή*, we find very clear examples of εἰς encroaching on its domain. There are many New Testament passages where a real distinction between εἰς and ἐν is impossible to draw without excessive subtlety, for which all the motive is gone when we find in modern Greek στό with accusative (= εἰς τόν) the substitute for the now obsolete dative, and the language

[1] Helbing, in the latest issue (1904) of Schanz's *Beiträge*, p. 11, gives a table for the respective frequency of dat., gen. and accus. with prepositions, which works out for Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon, taken together, at 1: 1·2: 3; for twelve post-classical historians, from Polybius to Zosimus, at 1: 1·5: 2·4.

[2] This is well seen by comparing the statistics of Helbing, pp. 8 f. He gives the figures for the three favourite prepositions of the historians. Ἐν is one of the three in every one except Polybius, Diodorus and Josephus; εἰς falls out of the list in Eusebius only. The total occurrences of εἰς in the three classical historians amount to 6,531, those of ἐν to 6,031; while in the twelve Hellenistic writers εἰς comes to 31,651, and ἐν to only 17,130. Contrast the New Testament, where St. Mark and the author of

in its intermediate stages working up to this ultimate goal. Side by side with this we may put the disappearance of *ὑπό* with the dative, the accusative serving to express both motion and rest. In the classical historians the dative is nearly as frequent as the accusative, and some of their successors, notably Appian and Herodian, made it greatly outnumber its rival—see Helbing, *op. cit.*, p. 22. Similarly we find that *πρός* with dative is in New Testament less than ·01 of *πρός* with accusative: in the three classical historians it averages nearly ·12, in the later twelve ·01 again. *Ἐπί* and *παρά* are the only prepositions in which the use with three cases can be called really alive in the Greek Testament.

We pass on to other symptoms of senescence in the dative. In the papyri there are some clear examples of an accusative expressing point of time instead of duration (see *Class. Rev.* xviii. 152); and in John iv. 52[1] and Rev. iii. 3 we may recognize the same thing. Of course the dative of "time when" was still very much more common. There were not wanting, indeed, cases where a classical use of the accusative, such as that of specification (Goodwin, *Greek Gram.* § 1058), has yielded to a dative of reference (instrumental): cf. *Class. Rev.* xv. 438, xviii. 153, and the useful program by Compernass, *De Sermone Gr. Volg. Pisidiae Phrygiaeque meridionalis*, p. 20 f. We have examples of its survival in John vi. 10 *al.* (WM. 288 f.); but, as in the papyri, the dative is very much commoner. The evidence of the decay of the dative was examined with great minute-

Hebrews are the only writers who prefer *εἰς* to *ἐν*, and the total occurrences amount to 1,743 and 2,698 respectively. It is noteworthy that in the New Testament *ἐπί*, which in the twelve writers of literary Κοινή comes not far behind *ἐν* (14,093), is less than two-fifths as common as *ἐν*, being level with *ἐκ*, which does not figure in Helbing's list at all. The order of precedence in the New Testament goes on with *πρός* (·25 of *ἐν*), *διά* and *ἀπό* (·24), *κατά* and *μετά* (·17), *περί* (·13), *ὑπό* (·08), *παρά* (·07), *ὑπέρ* (·054), *σύν* (·048), *πρό* (·018), *ἀντί* (·008), *ἀνά* (·004).

[1] With *ὥραν*, however, the use began in classical times: see Blass, *N.T. Gr.*, 94.

ness by F. Krebs in his three pamphlets, *Zur Rection der Casus in der späteren historischen Grăcität* (1887–1890). He deals only with the literary *Κοινή*, but we may profitably take up his points in order and show from the New Testament how these tendencies of the artificial dialect are really derived from the vernacular. Krebs begins with verbs which are beginning to take the accusative, having been confined to the dative in the earlier language. The distinction in meaning between transitive verbs and verbs whose object was really an instrumental (as with *χρῆσθαι*), or a dative of person interested, inevitably faded away with time, and the grammatical distinction became accordingly a useless survival. Of his examples, *πολεμεῖν* takes accus. also in vernacular, *ἐνεδρεύειν* and *εὐδοκεῖν* in the New Testament; but *ξενίζεσθαι*, *ἀπαντᾶν* and *ὑπαντᾶν* retain the dative there.[1] The movement was accompanied with various symptoms of reaction. *Προσκυνεῖν* in the New Testament takes the dative about twice as often as the accusative. The phrase *παραβάλλεσθαι τῇ ψυχῇ* (Polybius) has its innovating dative matched with *παραβολεύεσθαι* in Phil. ii. 30. I must return to Krebs later, and here may dismiss the decay of the dative with the remark that the more illiterate papyri and inscriptions very decidedly show it before the New Testament had acquired any antiquity. The schoolboy of O.P. 119, often referred to already (p. 223 *al.*), uses *σέ* for *σοί* after *γράφω*, while later samples (see *Class. Rev.* as above) include such monstrosities as *τίνι λόγου* and *σὺν τῶν υἱῶν*.

The encroachments of the accusative as the object of a verb were naturally not confined to the dative. We may resume here the examples discussed by Krebs, to be found in his second part (1888). The Hellenistic verb *ἀπελπίζειν* generally takes accusative instead of the natural genitive, and

[1] Also, I may add, *πειθαρχεῖν*, which takes a gen., like *ἀκούω*, in a Ptolemaic papyrus and in an inscription. (I must take the opportunity of correcting my slip in the Expositor for February, 1903, p. 118, where I unaccountably call the construction with genitive "classical.")

this it seems to do in Luke vi. 35, if we read μηδένα with ℵ etc. and the Lewis Syriac (so Tischendorf, WH. margin and R.V. margin).[1] Κρατεῖν (Krebs ii. 14) takes the gen. only eight times in the New Testament, out of forty-six occurrences, but διαφέρειν ("surpass") has gen. always. Ἐντρέπεσθαι (p. 15) takes only the accus.[2] and so does κληρονομεῖν. Δράσσομαι (p. 17) has the accus. in the only place where it occurs, a citation from the LXX. There follows a category of intransitive verbs which in Hellenistic have begun to take a direct object in the accusative. Of these we recognize as New Testament examples ἐνεργεῖν (six times), συνεργεῖν (in Rom. viii. 28 AB and Origen), πλεονεκτεῖν (four times, and once in passive) and χορηγεῖν. The third part of Krebs's work (1890) deals with compound verbs and their cases. Here προσφωνεῖν c. accus. may claim Luke vi. 13, but it has the dative four times; ὑποτρέχειν has accus. in its only occurrence; ἐπέρχεσθαι has only dative or prepositional phrase; καταβαρεῖν occurs once, c. accus.; καταλαλεῖν takes gen. in New Testament, but is once passive, as is καταπονεῖν in its two occurrences; while κατισχύειν shows no sign of the accus. construction.

It would of course be easy to supplement from the New Testament grammar these illustrations of a general tendency, but exhaustive discussion is not needed here. I should pass on to note a few special characteristics of the individual cases as they appear in New Testament Greek, as contrasted with the earlier language. Before doing so, however, I must make some general observations, the bearing of which will not be limited to the subject at present engaging us. We must not assume, from the evidence just presented as to variation of case with verbs, that old dis-

[1] Of course μηδέν, if not to be read μηδέν', is an internal or adverbial accus., *nil desperantes*.

[2] A passage from Dionysius (Krebs 16), οὔτε θεῖον φοβηθέντες χόλον οὔτε ἀνθρωπίνην ἐντραπέντες νέμεσιν, bears a curiously close resemblance to Luke xviii. 2.

tinctions of meaning have necessarily vanished, or that we may treat as mere equivalents those constructions which are found in common with the same word. The very fact that in John iv. 23 *προσκυνεῖν* is found with dative and then with accusative is enough to prove the existence of a difference, subtle no doubt but real, between the two, unless the writer is guilty of a most improbable slovenliness. The fact that the maintenance of an old and well-known distinction between the accusative and the genitive with *ἀκούω* saves the author of *Acts* from a patent self-contradiction (ix. 7, xxii. 9) should by itself be enough to make us recognize it for St. Luke, and for other writers until it is proved wrong. So with the subtle and suggestive variation from genitive to accusative with *γεύεσθαι* in Heb. vi. 4, 5.[1] Further, the statement that because *εἰς* often denotes rest in or at, and sometimes represents that motion *towards* (as distinguished from motion *to*) which may well have been the primitive differentia of the dative, therefore it is immaterial whether we have *εἰς* or *ἐν* or the simple dative with any particular word, would be entirely unwarrantable. It depends upon the character of the word itself. If its content be limited, it may well happen that hardly any appreciable difference may be made by placing it in one or another of certain nearly equivalent relations to a noun. But if it is a word of large content and extensive use, we naturally expect to find these alternative expressions made use of to define the different ideas connected by the word they qualify, so as to set up a series of phrases having a perfectly definite meaning. In such a case we should expect to see the original

[1] To supplement with a lexical example, we need not think that the evidence which makes *ἐρωτᾶν* in the vernacular no longer restricted to the meaning *question* (cf. Expositor, Dec. 1903, p. 431), compromises the antithesis between the verbs in John xvi. 23, rightly given by R.V. margin. Our English *ask* is the complete equivalent of the Hellenistic *ἐρωτᾶν*, and if we translated *αἰτήσητε* by some other word, say *beg* or *petition*, we should naturally take *ask* to mean *question* there. See Westcott or Milligan-Moulton *in loc.*

force of these expressions, obsolete in contexts where there was nothing to quicken it, brought out vividly where the need of a distinction stimulated it into new life. A critical example is the construction of πιστεύω, as to which Blass *N.T. Gr.* 110 declares that (in addition to the prepositional construction, with the meaning "believe in") it takes the dative "*passim* even in the sense 'to believe in,' as in Acts v. 14, xviii. 8."[1] Again, p. 123, "πιστεύειν εἰς alternates with πιστ. ἐν (Mark i. 15) and πιστ. ἐπί, in addition to which the correct classical πιστ. τινί appears." Let us examine this. In classical Greek, as Liddell and Scott observe, "the two notions" of πιστεύειν *believe* and *believe in* "run into each other." To be unable to distinguish ideas so vitally different in the scheme of Christianity would certainly have been a serious matter for the New Testament writers. Blass allows that with the preposition the meaning is *believe in.* Is this meaning ever found with the simple dative, or is this the appropriated locution to express the other idea alone? The answer must, it would seem, come from examination of the New Testament passages, rather than from outside. There are about forty occurrences of πιστεύειν with dative, apart from those where the meaning is *entrust.* It will be admitted that in the great majority of these passages the meaning is *believe.* There remain a few passages where the alternative is arguable, such as John v. 24, 38 (in which the λογος just preceding shows that *believe* is more appropriate), viii. 31 (where the variation from the previous π. εἰς cannot be merely accidental), Acts v. 14 (where the dative may be construed with προσετίθεντο, as in R.V.), xvi. 34 and xviii. 8 (where accepting the truth of God's word completely satisfies the connexion). It might be said that the influence of the LXX tends towards a weakening of the normal distinction in the phrase π. τῷ θεῷ. But it is very clear that the LXX is not responsible for the New

[1] This passage is dropped in the German 2nd edition.

Testament use of πιστεύειν. The only prepositional phrase used in the LXX is that with ἐν, which is itself very rare, and this occurs in only one New Testament passage, Mark i. 15.[1] That with ἐπί, which outside St. John is commoner than εἰς, is found in Isa. xxviii. 16, where B omits, and conformity to the New Testament application of the passage may well have occasioned its insertion in ℵAQ. It would seem therefore as if the substitution of εἰς or ἐπί for the simple dative may have obtained currency first in Christian circles, where the importance of the difference between mere belief (הֶאֱמִין לְ) and personal trust (ה״בְּ) was keenly realized. The prepositional construction was suggested no doubt by its being a more literal translation of the Hebrew phrase with בְּ. But in itself it was entirely on the lines of development of the Greek language, as we have seen. There was, moreover, a fitness in it for the use for which it was specialized. To repose one's trust upon God or Christ was well expressed by πιστεύειν ἐπί, the dative suggesting more of the state, and the accusative more of the initial act; while εἰς recalls at once the bringing of the soul into that mystical union which St. Paul loved to express by ἐν Χριστῷ—that great phrase the common use of which by three Apostles sufficiently evidences the source from whence it came.[2]

The space we have devoted to this single example of alleged equivalence must be our excuse for letting it stand by itself at this stage of our survey. Its great intrinsic importance makes it a specially good rallying-point against a tendency to exaggerate some of the results of the latest Hellenistic research. It is only with the utmost diffidence that we can venture to criticise the foremost grammarian of our time, but it is impossible to overlook in Blass's

[1] Eph. i. 13 is only an apparent exception, for the second ἐν ᾧ is assimilated to the first and is determined by ἐσφραγίσθητε.

[2] It may be convenient to give a table of the constructions of πιστεύω

brilliant *New Testament Grammar* a yielding to this tendency which calls for frequent caution. A scholar supremely at home among the niceties of classical speech, and not sufficiently alive to the smallness of the part which Semitism must play in our study of the late Greek vernacular,[1] he can hardly avoid the inclination to regard the fine distinctions of the ancient language as lost under the solvent forces of foreign influence and decadent culture. To a very large extent this is undeniably true, as we have seen in not a few instances already and shall see in many more. In the light of the papyri and of modern Greek we are compelled to give up some grammatical scruples which figure largely in commentators like Westcott, and colour many passages of the R.V. But it does not follow that we must cheerfully obliterate every grammatical distinction which was obsolete in the daily conversation of the first century Egyptian farmer. We are in no danger now of reviving Hatch's idea that phrases which could translate the same Hebrew must be equivalent to one another. The papyri have slain this

with a noun (not meaning *entrust*). As before, the table is from WH text, ignoring all the doubly bracketed passages.

	c. εἰς.	*c.* ἐπί.		*c.* ἐν.	*c.* dat.	Total
		dat.	acc.			
Matthew . . .	1	—	1	—	4	6
Mark	—	—	—	1	1	2
Luke and Acts .	3	1	4	—	9	17
John and 1 John	37	—	—	—	18	55
Paul	3	4	2	—	6	15
James	—	—	—	—	1	1
1 Peter	1	1	—	—	—	2
Total . .	45	6	7	1	39	98

In other writers only used absolute. 1 John iv. 16 is omitted, as ἐγνώκαμεν determines the construction. So also are Acts v. 14 and Eph. i. 13 for reasons given above.

[1] Blass's book came out in 1896, and Deissmann's *Bibelstudien* in 1895, so that this only means that he did not anticipate Deissmann's pioneer work.

very Euclid-like axiom, but they must not enslave us to others as dangerous. The New Testament must still be studied largely by light drawn from itself. Books written on the same subject and within the same circle must always gather some amount of identical style or idiom, a kind of technical terminology, which may often preserve a usage of earlier language, obsolescent because not needed in more slovenly colloquial speech of the same time. The various conservatisms of our own religious dialect, even on the lips of uneducated people, may serve as a parallel up to a certain point. We are justified by these considerations in examining each New Testament writer's language first by itself and then in connexion with that of his fellow-contributors to the sacred volume; and we may allow ourselves to retain the original force of distinctions which were dying or dead in every-day parlance, when there is a sufficient body of internal evidence, especially from passages where antithesis in the same context seems to demand them. Of course we shall not be tempted to use this principle when the whole of our evidence denies a particular survival to Hellenistic vernacular: in such a case we could only find it as a definite literary revival, rarely possible in St. Luke, and conceivable in St. Paul and the writer of *Hebrews*.

We shall need to refer back to these general cautions often in our future inquiries, and notably when we come to the tenses. If we have hung them upon πιστεύω as a convenient peg, it is only because this is our first opportunity under the Syntax of insisting on a caution which seems by no means superfluous in the present stage of grammatical study. The length of this necessary digression requires the postponement of a few further remarks on the cases one by one.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

INDEX.

PAGE

Rev. Professor W. Emery Barnes, D.D.

Psalm lxix. 332

Rev. T. Barns, M.A.

Tho Catholic Epistles of Themison 369

Rev. Professor W. H. Bennett, D.D., Litt.D.

The Life of Christ according to St. Mark . . 76, 201, 301

Very Rev. Professor J. H. Bernard, D.D.

The Death of Judas 422

Rev. Arthur Carr, M.A.

The Authorship of the Emmaus Incident 121

Dom Chapman, O.S.B.

The Seven Churches of Asia 257

Rev. Professor T. K. Cheyne, D.D.

An Appeal for a Higher Exegesis 1

Rev. Professor Samuel Ives Curtiss.

Some Religious Usages of the Dhîâb and Ruala Arabs, and their Old Testament Parallels 275

Rev. Professor W. L. Davidson, LL.D.

The Bible Story of Creation: a Phase of the Theistic Argument. 286

Rev. Professor James Denney, D.D.

Adam and Christ in St. Paul 147

Rev. Professor S. R. Driver, D.D.

Translations from the Prophets: Jeremiah xvi. 10–xx. 18 104

" " " " xxx.–xxxi. . 174

" " " " xxv . . 394

PAGE

Rev. Professor G. G. Findlay, D.D.

Studies in the First Epistle of John :
2. The True Knowledge of God 36
3. The Old and New Commandment 226

Rev. M. Kaufmann, M.A.

Was the "Weeping Prophet" a Pessimist? . . . 186

E. E. Kellett, M.A.

St. Paul the Poet 339

Rev. J. B. Mayor, M.A., D.Lit.

Φθινοπωρινός 98
Notes on the Text of the Epistle of Jude 450

Rev. George Milligan, M.A., D.D.

The Authenticity of the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians 430

Rev. Professor J. H. Moulton, M.A., D.Lit.

Characteristics of New Testament Greek 67, 215, 310, 359, 461

Rev. Professor A. S. Peake, M.A.

A Reply to Dr. Denney 47

Professor W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L., LL.D.

The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia 20, 81, 161, 241, 321
The Letter to the Church in Pergamum . . . 401

Professor Alex. Souter, M.A.

Some Thoughts on the Study of the Greek New Testament 133

Rev. Canon Todd, M.A., B.Sc.

On the "Aristocratic" Character of the Old Testament . 129

Rev. T. H. Weir, M.R.A.S.

The Koran and the "Books of Moses" 349

Rev. Newport J. D. White, M.A.

The Testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of Prophecy . . 266

INDEX TO TEXTS.

	PAGE
Genesis xvii. 18	177
xix. 25	119
xxxi. 27	120
Exodus xiii. 11–15	283
xv. 20	282
xx. 24	282
Leviticus i. 4	285
Deuteronomy i.	285
xx. 6	178
2 Samuel vii. 8	182
1 Kings xi. 4–7	279
xiv. 3	114
2 Kings iii. 27	282
ix. 30	278
xxi. 12	115
xxiii. 12	116
2 Chronicles xxxv. 25	191
Nehemiah i. 3	333
iii. 1	184
iv. 17	335
Psalms vi. 1	175
xxiv. 8	281
xxxi. 13	118
xli. 9	118
lxix.	332
Isaiah i. 6	176
i. 26	182
x. 27	175
xiii. 6–15	174
xxx. 23	182
xxxvi.–xxxix.	7
xlii. 13	119
xlix. 10	179
lv. 4	267
Jeremiah iv. 30	278
ix. 1	187
xvi. 10–xx. 18	104
xxv. 1–12	394
13–24	396
25–35	398
xxx. 1–13	175
xxxi. 15–22	181
Ezekiel vii. 26	113
xxi. 12	181
xxiii. 40.	278
xxxvii. 3	322
xliv. 13	177
Hosea iii. 5	175
vii. 5	129
xi. 1	280
Amos ii. 8	129
v. 1	191
Micah ii. 2	129
iii. 5	281
Matthew iii. 9	216
v. 18	462
22	233
ix. 18	322
xi. 12	231
xxvii. 1–9	430
Mark i. 17	362
iv. 1–34	201
35–41	205
41	462
v. 1–20	207
21–43	208
vi. 1–6	212
7–30	301
31–44	303
45–56	304
vii. 1–23	306
Luke iii. 8	215
vi. 35	467
x. 1–7	126
xvii. 10	14
xxii. 49	73
xxiv. 25–27	280
26–28	121
John i. 10–11	239
14.	365
40	125
iv. 23	468
v. 25	322
viii. 31	39
xi. 17	316
xii. 20	127
35	233
xiv. 15	37
xv. 10	37
12	227
xx. 21	15
Acts i. 8	268
v. 14	169
vi. 7.	270

	PAGE
Acts viii. 27	127
x. 34–43	122
xi. 28	127
xvi. 1	446
xvi. 11	31
xvii. 3	123
xvii. 28	39
xix. 10	22
xx. 29	221
xxi. 5	21
20	271
xxvi. 16	268
Romans i. 3–5	123
14	91
ii. 16	91
v. 12–21	49, 147
15	59
vii. 17	55
viii. 1	64
19–21	52
1 Corinthians i. 6	268
ii. 14	456
iv. 11, 13	231
21	73
v. 5	460
vi. 17	62, 155
20	44
ix. 16	44
xi. 3	152
xiv. 3	271
xv. 50	462
3. 4	123

	PAGE
1 Corinthians xv. 22	51, 151
47	58
50	462
xvi. 2	367
21	450
2 Corinthians i. 19	374
ii. 12	21
iv. 4	233
5	272
v. 14	51
15	45
Galatians ii. 17	64
iv. 6	71
v. 25	43
Ephesians ii. 12	57
17	104
v. 1, 2	45
Colossians iv. 13	22
2 Thessalonians ii. 7	95
1 Timothy vi. 13	267
Hebrews ii. 11–17	59
1 John ii. 7–11	226
Jude 12	98
Revelation i. 16	316
ii. 18	372
v. 9	44
ix. 12	462
ix. 14	316
xv. 32	359
36	313
xix. 10	266

Butler & Tanner, The Selwood Printing Works, Frome, and London.

FOR REFERENCE

Do Not Take From This Room

DEMCO